

PHRENOLOGICAL

CONTROVERSY.

ANSWER TO VINDEK,

son quire
BY O. S. FOWLER,

WITH OTHER PHRENOLOGICAL MATTER.

MY POLE-STAR IS TRUTH.

BALTIMORE:
PRINTED BY JOHN W. WOODS,
No. 1, Light street.
1835.

PREFACE.

When the following "answers to Vindex" were first written, the author had no distant idea of presenting them in a pamphlet form. He derived his first suggestion of the kind, from the following editorial article in the SATURDAY MORNING VISITOR.

PHRENOLOGY.—The discussion on this subject by Vindex and Mr. Fowler, through the medium of the Chronicle, seems to have excited a good deal of attention in other cities, and as the articles are pretty generally copied, it is a proof that the subject is one which the public are desirous of investigating—we agree with the following remarks of the Telegraph, as to the mode by which such investigation is most likely to be fairly made. "We are surprised that Mr. F. does not see the suspicions which the communications of VINDEK are calculated to excite. Many persons will believe—mistakenly we are certain, that VINDEK writes in collision with Mr. Fowler, and that his objections are purposely made in such a form that they may be easily answered. We say to Mr. Fowler, let us have a pamphleton each side: they will instruct and amuse. They will sell well; for the intelligent part of the community are interested in the subject. The large books on the subject are too expensive for extensive diffusion."

The discussion, thus hastily prepared, is accordingly published, with the hope that it may remove some of the oft-repeated objections made against one of the most sublime and useful sciences ever discovered.

The editor of the Telegraph is right in supposing that Vindex writes as he thinks—that he is *really*, and not seemingly, opposed to Phrenology. It is to be regretted, however, that he did not better embody, and more clearly present, the objections and arguments of anti-phrenologists.

Instead of presenting the discussion as it at first appeared in the Chronicle, the author has, for the sake of unity, placed together all the paragraphs that appeared on a single subject, though some of them appeared in different numbers. Some of the replies to Vindex have been enlarged, and other points taken up that were not noticed in the Chronicle. Miscellaneous matter has also been added.

To mere literary merit, and elegance of style, the author makes no pretensions. His *chief* effort is to present **STRONG ARGUMENTS in a PERSPICUOUS MANNER.**

Particular attention is invited to the objections so generally urged against Phrenology, on the ground that it leads to fatalism, destroys moral responsibility, favors materialism, and is anti-christian in its tendency.

The author lays no claim to perfection, and hopes his comparative youth and inexperience will account for most of his errors. He will be thankful for any valuable suggestions by way of criticism.

Baltimore, July 15th, 1835.

Phrenological Controversy.

FOR THE CHRONICLE.

PROPOSAL FOR A PHRENOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

Mr. Barnes—As Phrenology has many enthusiastic votaries, and also violent opposers, and is sharing largely the attention of all classes, a properly conducted discussion on this subject may, perhaps, furnish some very interesting matter for your paper. If you feel disposed to open your columns to such a discussion, the pole-star of which shall be **TRUTH**, rather than *victory*, please to give the following an insertion.

There are those that see many, and very strong, reasons for believing that Phrenology is true, who yet stumble at some seemingly insurmountable objections to it. There are others, especially among professors of religion, who, fearing that its tendency is to infidelity and fatalism, and being apprehensive that its influence is immoral and irreligious, have honest and deep-rooted prejudices against it. There are others, again, who ridicule and scout the very idea, as “the hallucination of a moon-struck imagination.”* Now, if any one, or more than one, of either, or of all the abovenamed classes, or of any other class of objectors or opposers to Phrenology, will state their objections to it, in as strong, yet concise, terms, as they please, through the columns of the Chronicle, they will be answered through the same medium by the subscriber.

O. S. FOWLER.

P. S. As for those fun-lovers, who propagate their humorous anecdotes, at the expense of Phrenology, merely from their love of jokes—why, do let them enjoy their frolic, as we indulge other sportive, but harmless insects. And let those who endeavor to put down Phrenology by ridicule, instead of argument, proceed; for they thus merely betray the weakness of their cause, inasmuch as ridicule is the last resort of a weak and vanquished opponent.

O. S. F.

PHRENOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.—It will be seen by a communication in to-day's paper, that *Mr. O. S. Fowler* challenges the opponents of Phrenology to a fair and temperate discussion

* *Dr. Annan*, before the Medical Faculty of Maryland.

of this science. To such a discussion our columns shall be freely opened—for, if there be no truth in the science, it should be at once exposed and put down as an imposition—whilst, on the contrary, if its advocates shall be able to demonstrate that it is founded on truth, it should receive that credit and support to which it will be entitled from its importance. At all events, the discussion may afford amusement, if not instruction, to our readers. We therefore invite both sides to make use of our columns.—[*Ed. Ch.*

REPLY OF VINDEX.

Mr. Editor—In your paper of yesterday, a challenge was given to Anti-phrenologists to maintain their opinions through your columns. This challenge I am willing to accept, provided I can understand Mr. Fowler's opinions on certain points. As each Phrenologist has a system of his own, I would like to understand what Mr. F's. system is, and for that purpose I propound the following questions:

Is there an organ for each faculty of the mind?

Are there as many nerves leading from the junction of the spinal marrow and brain to the surface of the brain, as there are organs appointed by Phrenologists, or are there more?

Is not the skull liable to bony excrescences, and may they not be mistaken for phrenological organs?

Can a Phrenologist, by examining the cranium, pronounce decisively, whether a man is a liar, a thief, or a murderer, without reference to Physiognomy?

Is an organ increased in size by constant activity, and can that increase be observed by examining the cranium?

As conscience is a faculty of the mind, according to Phrenologists, and as I have near me the autobiography of several criminals of both sexes, who observe that the first step in crime was taken with great reluctance; that their minds were troubled for some time afterwards; but, that in time their conscience ceased to trouble them: did their organ of conscientiousness diminish in size as they progressed in crime?

As soon as an answer is made to these questions, I shall have some foundation on which to commence a series of arguments against the system.

VINDEX.

ANSWER TO VINDEX.

SIR.—In asserting that each Phrenologist has a system of his own, you presuppose what is not true; for in the *fundamental*

principles of Phrenology, there is perfect unanimity, except on points that are considered by *all* as not yet fully settled. It is *not* true that "each Phrenologist has a system of his own," any more than it is true that each physician has a medical system, each theologian a theological system, and each botanist a botanical system, of his own—although, it *is* true, that different phrenologists have different methods of explaining the same thing, and that some carry out points farther than others, because, perhaps, they have more extensively examined them. In the *naming* and *numbering* of some of the organs, and in their *analysis* of some of the faculties, Phrenologists differ somewhat; but in the *facts* and the *fundamental principles* of Phrenology, there is at the present time, greater unanimity among them than among the teachers of any other doctrine or science within my knowledge. Yours, &c. O. S. FOWLER.

REPLY OF VINDEK.

Mr. Editor,—Much as I admire Mr. Fowler's *tact* in answering questions propounded to him, I am not yet disposed to consider his answers satisfactory.

My assertion that each Phrenologist has a system of his own, was not a mere supposition. In Spurzheim's works on Phrenology and Physiognomy, he distinctly admits that there was a difference of opinion between Dr. Gall and himself on certain material points, which led to their separation. In Combe's Phrenology, we find several pages taken up in opposition to Spurzheim, on the organ of Inhabitiveness, and on other points, which Mr. F. can ascertain on perusing those works. The only *fundamental principle* Phrenologists agree upon with "great unanimity" is, that the brain is the seat of feeling and of thought—a principle, which few of their opponents will dispute.

I am not disposed to dwell any longer on the disagreement of Phrenologists. To do that effectually it will be necessary to state what are the *fundamental principles*, and wherein the different writers are at issue. But it will take up too much of your columns, without advancing the object of these papers. I have conversed with many Phrenologists and I find that few will admit as a fundamental principle "that the vigorous exercise of any particular faculty causes a protuberance in a particular part of the brain" [cranium?] I suppose Mr. F. will not call any man a Phrenologist, unless he believes every thing that Gall, Spurzheim and Combe have written on the subject.

VINDEK.

ANSWER TO VINDEK.

Allow me a word more about the alleged difference among Phrenologists. True, Drs. Gall and Spurzheim *did* differ; but not about *fundamental principles*. But I repeat, and without fear of contradiction, that this difference was in the *naming* and *numbering* of the organs, their *analysis*, or some similar point, which was not *fundamental*. In every case of their disagreement with which I am acquainted, the points in dispute were considered by *both* as unsettled. You mention the difference between Combe and Spurzheim on Inhabitiveness. The discovery of that organ is comparatively recent, and considered by all as doubtful. One has one *opinion*, another, another. Now, sir, I believe they may both be right—that there may be two organs, the one that of Spurzheim, the other that of Combe. By the way, this is the only instance of the kind, you could have cited from these two authors.

You also assert, that between Combe and Spurzheim there are differences “on other points” than the organ of Inhabitiveness. Combe himself says, “To the best of my knowledge, there is no material point of doctrine on which Spurzheim and I differ, except concerning the organ of Inhabitiveness. (Preface to Combe’s System of Phrenology—which I take pleasure in recommending.) Whether Combe or you are right, I leave to the decision of those who peruse the works of Combe and Spurzheim. The *probability* is, that Combe knows as much about this subject, at least, as yourself, and that he would not, knowingly, misrepresent it.

You say “the only *fundamental principle* that Phrenologists agree upon is, that the brain is the seat of feeling and thought—a principle which few of their opponents will dispute.” Now, sir, I do not say that your *assertion* is not true, but merely ask you, do not *all* Phrenologists agree, and that with “*great unanimity*,” not only that the brain is the organ of the mind, but, that the mind is a congregate of faculties—that each faculty is exercised by means of, not the whole brain, but a certain part of it—that the vigorous exercise of any particular faculty, causes a corresponding exercise of its organ, and that this exercise of the organ causes its enlargement—that, consequently, traits of character and peculiarities of disposition and talent, are accompanied and indicated by certain protuberances of the brain, and of course of the skull, so that a man’s character, talents, &c. can be discovered by the size and shape of his head? And are not these *fundamental principles*—as much so as the

one you mention? If you answer in the affirmative, you contradict yourself; if in the negative, the concurring testimony of all Phrenologists, and of all acquainted with these points, contradicts you. Answer it as you will, the *fact* is *indisputable* that Phrenologists *do* agree in other fundamental principles than the one you mention. Ergo, your statement is erroneous.

I have yet to learn, that between Dr. Spurzheim and all succeeding Phrenologists, there exists the least opposition on any fundamental, or even *material* point. On the contrary, the utmost unanimity prevails, not only in their objects, and feelings, but also even in the most *minute details* of Phrenology.

True, as the science is advancing with unparalleled rapidity, some suppose they have made improvements, which others, not having made sufficient observations, are not prepared, either to admit or deny. This explains almost every point of difference between Gall and Spurzheim. But in all this there is no *opposition* of views. Gall *originated* the science, Spurzheim *improved* it. When these improvements were first suggested by the latter, they were questioned by the former, but before his death, Gall fell in with many of the views suggested by Spurzheim. A single illustration on this point will suffice. Dr. Gall observed that a particular portion of the head was large in haughty individuals, and called it the organ of haughtiness. Spurzheim observed that sometimes one part of that region was small, and the other large, that when the upper part was large, and the lower part small, the individual had a feeling of highmindedness, superiority, and self-respect, and no love of home, and that when the other part was large, and this small, there was a propensity to locate, and a strong attachment to home. He accordingly called the upper part Self-Esteem, and the lower, Inhabitiveness. My own observation convinces me that the same is true of the difference between Combe and Spurzheim on Inhabitiveness, though I have hardly sufficient confidence in my own observations even to venture the suggestion.

The same is true of Acquisitiveness and Secretiveness. Dr. Gall found that a certain part of the head was very large in inveterate thieves, and, as was perfectly natural, named it the organ of theft. Dr. Spurzheim discovered that in this region two organs were located, that when one part was large and the other small, there was a propensity to acquire and hoard up, but no propensity to conceal, and *vica versa*. He therefore named one Acquisitiveness, and the other Secretiveness. Both are necessary to adroit thieves, yet persons are often found with one

large, and the other small. This discrepancy was occasioned by a new discovery, and does not *at all* invalidate the truth of Phrenology. The same is true of every material difference between the two authors, with which I am acquainted, except that about the analysis and naming of the organs. Gall discovered the organs when in excess, and consequently named them from their abuse, and as his chief attention was directed to the *discovery* of organs, and the observation of facts, he of course paid little regard to the *analysis* of the organs. Having collected a great abundance of materials, and thus laid a deep and unimperishable foundation for the most beautiful and stupendous of the sciences, Spurzheim enters the field, makes a few valuable discoveries, and by his extraordinary powers of discrimination, *analyses the faculties*, and erects a magnificent superstructure, which is destined to be the admiration of all coming ages, as the richest boon ever yet bequeathed by any man to his fellow men. In doing this, it was *necessary* to change the *names* of some of the organs. To this Gall, as was natural, at first objected, but gradually yielded point after point, till, at his death, there was much less disagreement than there had formerly been.

This is the amount of the difference among Phrenologists. The assertion, then, that "each Phrenologist has a system of his own," has no foundation in fact. I however regret that you had not yourself stated *wherein* Phrenologists disagree, so that our readers might be sure that the best anti-phrenological construction might be put upon it that *could* be.

I closed my remarks on this point, with this question: "Do I understand you to urge this as an objection against Phrenology? If so, I will meet you on that ground, when you shall have stated your argument." You have never answered this question. Had you answered it in the negative, I should have replied, then why adduce it? If in the affirmative, I should have said, if your argument proves *any thing*, it proves *too much*; for it would *equally* prove that the sciences of Medicine, of Chymistry, of Botany, of Mineralogy, of Mechanics, of Electricity, of mental and moral Philosophy, and even of *Mathematics* and *Astronomy*, are *all* untrue. The most eminent mathematicians dispute, to this day, whether or not the circle can be completely squared; even though this is one of the *oldest*, and one of the *demonstrative* sciences. But does *this* prove that the sublime principles of astronomy are untrue—that two and two do not make four? Just as much as a difference among

Phrenologists disproves Phrenology. Between Franklin and Du Fay there was a *fundamental* difference about electricity,—the former maintaining that there were two electric fluids; the latter, that there was but one. But does *this* prove that there is no such thing as an electric fluid, or even that its supposed laws are merely “the hallucination of a moon-struck imagination?” Most certainly; if your argument is sound. Your argument, if it proves any thing, applies with a *thousand-fold* force, to the science of Medicine. It is proverbial that scarce any two Doctors can agree, in a single case, either in regard to the disease or its remedy. And not only do *individuals* disagree and backbite each other, but there are conflicting *systems*, diametrically opposed to each other. The difference *here* is *fundamental*—is *heaven wide*? And yet is there *no truth at all in any part* of the healing art? Not a bit, if your argument has the *least* weight. But enough. With this argument, stated in the form of your much praised syllogism, I can prove that there is no *God*, no *future state*, no *science*, no any thing; for, different men take different views of almost every subject. If all men thought just alike, no new discoveries could be made. This argument is certainly too weak to be adduced, especially in a cause so strong as that of Anti-phrenology.

You ask, “Are there as many nerves leading from the junction of the spinal marrow and brain, to the surface of the brain, as there are organs appointed* by Phrenologists, or are there more?” I answer, no such nerves have, to my knowledge, yet been discovered; but this no more proves that such nerves do not exist, than ignorance of the laws of chymistry, of astronomy, or of physiology, prove that these laws do not exist. Nor is this a material point; for we *never* rely on the *dissection* of an organ for a discovery, or even *proof*, of its *function*. My views of the anatomy of the brain, agree entirely with those of Dr. Spurzheim, who, by the unanimous consent of all the first anatomists in the world, made most valuable discoveries relative to the anatomy of the brain, and, at his death, knew more of that organ than any other man. This conclusively proves that the anatomy of the brain, so far from disproving Phrenology, is greatly indebted to it.

I shall discuss the anatomy of the brain no farther than is necessary to answer those objections which may be urged against Phrenology, on anatomical principles; for very few of our readers would take the least interest in such a discussion.

* Phrenologists have never “appointed,” but merely discovered, organs.

They are chiefly *practical* men, and would care little about *theory*, especially the theory of the brain, which, without the aid of Phrenology, is little understood, even by its ablest teachers.

Yours, &c.

O. S. FOWLER.

REPLY OF VINDEK.

Mr. F. is more willing to give up the consideration of the anatomy of the brain, than I am. As our readers are *practical* men, they can easily learn what has been observed by *practical* anatomists. If there be any *theory* in considering the subject, it is on the part of Mr. F., who argues that the fact of none of the nerves of the different organs, having, to his knowledge, been discovered, is no proof that such nerves do not exist. Now, when an affirmative is stated, it must be proved by *facts*, otherwise it is only a *theory*. It is not incumbent on us* to prove that such nerves do *not* exist—that they have not been discovered is sufficient proof of that fact. We all know that the nerves of the organs of seeing, hearing, smelling, &c., have been discovered, and their course has been traced to various portions of the brain.

It is well known that nerves have been discovered of the organs of seeing, hearing, smelling, &c. These are *corporeal* organs. Mr. F. calls all the organs, as laid down by Phrenology, corporeal organs. Now, if that be true, why have not nerves been discovered leading from each organ to the base of the brain? Mr. F. in his second number, says—"No such nerves have, to my knowledge, yet been discovered." Why have they not been discovered? would not such a discovery prove the fundamental principles of Phrenology better than mere conjecture? Are the nerves so small as not to be discovered by a microscope? They must be small indeed, for Lyonet has detected not less than four thousand and sixty-one nerves in the mere larve or caterpillar of a cossus, or insect approaching to a butterfly.

VINDEK.

You charge me with *assuming* the existence of the nerves of the organs, from their *non-discovery*—with arguing on that assumption, and with calling on you to disprove it. Now, sir, I neither *assume* nor *deny* their existence, nor do I predicate any argument whatever on it. I simply say, that the point is not

* *Us!* It seems, then, that "VINDEK" is in the *plural* number; of which this is not the only evidence.

material, and assign the reason. Your argument is this. No such nerves have been discovered; therefore, no such nerves *exist*—therefore Phrenology is not true. This syllogism lacks foundation. You must *first* prove, that these nerves are a *sine qua non*—an *indispensable requisite* to the truth of Phrenology. You assume this: I deny it. Your whole argument has not the weight of a feather, till you prove this point; for it is an *essential* one. After you have proved this (which you will find a very difficult task,) you will be obliged to prove that the non-discovery of such organs, establishes their non-existence; which you certainly *cannot* do. They may exist, and yet not be discoverable; not from their smallness, but from the nature of their *substance* and *texture*. The “nerves of the larve,” you mention, are nerves of *motion*; and, as the function of these nerves differ so widely from the function of the nerves of the organs, (on supposition that such nerves exist,) it is *prima facie* evident, that their *nature* and *texture* as widely differ. Their discovery, then, may be, and might be *expected* to be, altogether impossible by human instrumentality, inasmuch as their *function* is so subtle. If you had only stated your argument in that syllogistic form, which you so highly recommend,* you might have saved me, and the reader, all this trouble.

You plainly intimate that I am afraid to discuss the anatomy of the brain—that Phrenology is lame here—that I wish to cover this lameness under the plea that our readers will take little interest in the discussion of its theories. In this, sir, you are greatly mistaken. Do I not state that I am ready “to answer any objections that may be urged against Phrenology on anatomical principles?” Why then charge me with being “more willing to give up the anatomy of the brain than yourself?” No, sir, Phrenology, so far from being lame here, is most at home, and perfectly invulnerable; and, so far from wishing to evade this point, I am even *anxious* to take it up. State your anatomical objections, and see if I leave them unanswered. It is not for *me* to prove that anatomy does *not* contradict Phrenology, but for *you* to prove that it *does*. When you do this, you will do what no other man has ever yet done. But I mistake, or yours will be emphatically a herculean task, to point out any discrepance between the anatomy of the brain and Phrenology. Almost every expert anatomist adopts that mode of dissecting the brain which was discovered by the discoverers of Phrenology, and along with it. Medical schools and medical authors, are universally adopting the phrenologi-

cal anatomy of the brain; and the best dissections of the brain are those that proceed on phrenological principles. I was informed not three days since, by a former anatomical dissector, in the Medical College of Maryland, that Phrenology had thrown more light on the anatomy of the brain, than had ever been thrown on it before. Horner, a standard medical author, says, on the 76th page of his anatomy: "Theirs (Drs. Gall and Spurzheim's) is a very improved and simplified method of studying the anatomy of the brain, and of the nervous system." "It is an obvious matter of fact, and, for the most part, as susceptible of demonstration as the contents of the thorax." The *whole world* have long since been challenged to shew any contradiction between Anatomy and Phrenology. The ablest anatomists of christendom have tried it, and failed. If you try it, *you* will also fail. The fact is that anatomy is *nature*—Phrenology is also *nature*, and each will support the other. This is evident from the fact, that the only clear and rational anatomy of the brain, is that which was discovered by *Phrenologists*, *by means of* Phrenology, and *along with it*, thereby proving that they are the twin sisters of truth and nature. If you attempt to disprove Phrenology by anatomy, you will only spit in the wind, and of course, in your own face.

I really thought, by your manner of broaching this subject, that you intended something more than mere bravado. You say "as our readers are *practical* men, they can easily learn what has been observed by *practical* anatomists;" and yet do not proceed to state the observations of these practical anatomists, nor show how these observations clash with phrenological principles. True, you say, unfortunately for your argument, "It is known that the nerves of the organs of seeing, hearing, smelling, &c. have been discovered, and their course has been traced to various parts of the brain." It is *also* known that these nerves have been traced **EXCLUSIVELY** (am I not right?) to the **BASE** of the brain—the very part allotted by Phrenology to those functions which are common to men and animals. This part of the brain, as well as these nerves, is common to men and animals. The base of the brain, or that part to which these nerves have been traced, is the same part to which Phrenology has assigned the organs of the animal functions, and comprehends the whole of the animal brain. The organs of the sentiments peculiar to man, together with the *reasoning* organs are chiefly wanting in the *animal* brain, but occupy a large portion of the *human* brain. To this portion of the human brain, none of the nerves of the animal functions have been traced. This fact, so far from disproving Phrenology, is totally *inex-*

plicable on any other than phrenological principles, and goes far to establish these principles. Unless Phrenology is true, *why is it* that the *animal portion of the brain*, in animals, according to Phrenology, is alone developed? Unless Phrenology is true, *why is it* that the nerves of the animal functions originate in the animal portion of the brain? Unless Phrenology is true, *why is it* that in the part of the human brain, allotted by Phrenology to the moral and reasoning organs, where such nerves, not only are not necessary, but would be out of place, no such nerves are to be found? I put these questions home to you, and ask how they *can* be satisfactorily answered, only by admitting that between anatomy and Phrenology there exists a striking coincidence. The only statement, then, which you have made respecting the anatomy of the brain, bears strongly, if not *conclusively* against you, and as conclusively in favor of Phrenology. So it is with *every* anatomical argument which Anti-phrenological anatomists have yet adduced, or, I venture to say, *can* adduce.

EXCRESCENCES.

To your third question, "whether the skull is not liable to bony excrescences, which may be mistaken for phrenological organs," I answer no—and certainly not by any *expert* Phrenologist. True the skull *is* liable to bony excrescences, such as the mastoid process, the occipital bone, the frontal sinuses, and, perhaps, some others. But these seldom need be mistaken for phrenological organs; for we know their location and shape, and can ascertain their size by their shape. And since they seldom cover the *whole* of any organ, we can calculate the size of that organ, by the part that is unaffected by them. No, sir, an *expert* Phrenologist will mistake an excrescence, for an organ, more seldom than an *equally* expert physician will mistake a disordered stomach for an affection of the liver. A quack may mistake in both cases. Yours, &c. O. S. FOWLER.

REPLY OF VINDEK.

The writer of this has seen bony excrescences in parts of the skull, where "Cautiousness," "Firmness," "Hope," and "Ideality," are located. In some cases there were cavities of three quarters of an inch and as broad as any phrenological organ. Yet no Phrenologist, however *expert*, could have discovered that they were mere excrescences.

ANSWER TO VINDEK.

You and all other Anti-phrenologists carp a great deal about

the "*bony excrescences*," as though because the skull is liable to an occasional excrescence, there could be no truth in phrenological principles. Suppose the skull were *wholly covered* with these excrescences, the phrenological organs might exist, and perform their functions, just as well with as without them. If, then, your argument were stronger by a hundred fold than it now is, it would not *at all* invalidate the truth of the principles of Phrenology: and *this* is the point we are discussing. On the supposition that such excrescences were numerous, they would throw in the way of correct phrenological observations, a difficulty proportionate to their size and number. This is the most your argument can claim.

But so far from these excrescences being numerous, not one occurs on an average, in fifty heads, or in 3.500 organs, (there being 35 organs on each side of the head.) And even when an excrescence does occur, it is at least fifty chances to one, if it cover the *whole* of one organ, but generally a *part* of several: and a hundred more chances to one if its *shape* corresponded exactly with that of the organ: and then still another hundred, if it be just as large. So that the necessary chance of error is as one to 1.750.000.000. Have I underrated this difficulty? And suppose it is a million times greater than my estimate, the *necessary* chance for mistaking an excrescence for an organ is as thousands to one. And *even then*, it is hardly supposable that two excrescences should occur on *precisely opposite sides of the same head*, so that one side would correct the other. Why then should I waste words on so diminutive an argument?

You say "no Phrenologist, however *expert*, could have discovered that they were mere excrescences." On what ground do you hazard this assertion? On the failure of an expert Phrenologist? or do you say of yourself, that no Phrenologist, however *expert*, could have discovered what you could not discover? I appeal whether such a declaration does not indicate a high developement of self-esteem. Whether there is the corresponding organ, is open for further observation.

The same general remarks apply to the "*cavities*," only, these are still more easily detected. In my public examinations in this city I have detected three cavities, occasioned by blows on the head, in New York, at least two; in Albany and Troy, several; one in Brattleboro', Vt. and a number in other places. I now know of but a single mistake, in all my examinations, occasioned by cavities, and that was in this city. By a subsequent examination, the error was at once detected.

That these excrescences occasionally throw some difficulty

in the way, especially of the unpractised Phrenologist, I admit; but their shape is so irregular, and their knotty appearance differs so widely from the regular swell of the phrenological organs, that the Phrenologist must be comparatively a tyro in observation, whatever he may be in theory, who mistakes the one for the other. The difficulty seems to be far greater in theory than it really is in practice, especially to those who look at it, through the magnifying glass of prejudice.

But knowing Phrenologists are influenced far less by “excrescences” and “cavities” than by the general fullness of the head in the parts observed. Take a familiar instance from the busts of Franklin and Washington. In the latter, the organs located just above the eyes, are very large. Individuality, Form, Size, Order, Eventuality, Locality, and Comparison, are immensely large, while Causality is comparatively retiring. According to Phrenology, these organs would make their possessor just what Washington actually was—a matter-of-fact man, would give a popular, business talent, discrimination, observation and great tact. In Franklin, these organs were relatively much smaller, and while Causality and Mirthfulness were enormously large, making him, according to Phrenology, what he in fact was—a most profound thinker—an eminent philosopher. His large Mirthfulness would dispose and enable him to express his profound philosophical deductions in a humorous manner. Contrast the American with the Indian head—the English with the Hindoo—the African with the European—indeed contrast almost any two heads you see, and you cannot fail to discover an astonishing difference, *not* so much in their “*protuberances*” and “*cavities*” as in their *general conformation*, and their *outlines*. Some heads are round and smooth; others, very uneven. In some, the mass of brain lies in the bassilor region, in others in the coronal, in others still, in the frontal. Some heads are long and narrow, others, shorter and broader. Look at the head of Aurelia Chase, the colored wretch that was executed in Baltimore in 1834, after having murdered seven individuals. The phrenological developement of the whole animal region, especially of Destructiveness, Combativeness, Secretiveness, Firmness, Self-esteem, and Amativeness are as large as almost any I have ever seen, whilst Benevolence and the reasoning organs, are comparatively mere pigmies. She met death with all the imaginable haughtiness and fortitude of a hardened wretch, regretting only that she could not glut her still greedy thirst for blood, and wreak her vengeance on others who were obnoxious to her displeasure. Contrast her head, phrenologically, and her char-

acter too, with those of Lord Bacon, Newton, Hannah More, or any other great personage, and their phrenological contrast is as great as that of their characters, and corresponds with it.

Now, for every effect there is some *cause*. Something *causes* this difference in the shape of heads. If the brain were a *single* organ, *analogy* proves that its *shape* must be *uniform*, in *all* heads. The eye, the ear, the nose, the stomach, the lungs, the liver, &c. unless distorted by disease, all have the *same* *SHAPE* in different individuals. But scarce any two persons have the same shaped *brain*. Now *why* is this? On the supposition that the brain is a single organ, this phenomena is *totally inexplicable*—is contrary to the *uniform laws of nature*. And the fact that a certain shape of the head, mere excrescences and cavities excepted, is *invariably* accompanied with certain developements of the mind, makes the argument *absolutely conclusive*. It amounts to a *PHYSICAL DEMONSTRATION* of the truth of Phrenology. Yours, &c. O. S. FOWLER.

MEMORY.

You ask, "Is there an organ for each faculty of the mind?" I answer, yes, so far as these faculties have, as yet, been discovered. You then say, as "Mr. F. admits, that there is an organ for each faculty of the mind, will he state where the faculty of memory is located; and what name Phrenologists have given to it?"

Pray, sir, what am I to understand by the faculty of memory? I deny that there is such a separate faculty. One man always remembers a friend, (Adhesiveness large,) but soon forgets an enemy; another always remembers an enemy, (Destructiveness large,) but soon forgets a friend; and some never forget either. One remembers his debtors, (Acquisitiveness large;) another his creditors, (Conscientiousness large.) In listening to a speaker, one can repeat whole speeches, almost verbatim, (Language large,) but retains scarce a single idea; another will retain every important idea, (Causality large,) but cannot repeat a single sentence. One can commit whole pages of mere algebraic characters, from which he gets not a single idea, and that by reading it only twice; another might read a page a hundred times, without being able to repeat it. But let him get the *demonstrations*, or the *idea*, and he will *never* forget it.

I appeal to each reader, if he does not find it as easy to remember some things as it is difficult to remember others, while his partner remembers what he forgets, and forgets what he remembers. One never forgets a principle, but never retains facts, dates, words, faces, places, figures, &c., while another

never forgets these, but never retains principles. There are almost as many different kinds of memory as there are different minds, and those kinds of memory differ as much from each other as the head does from the foot—as much as reason does from feeling. I repeat it—*What do you mean by “the faculty of memory?”—Memory of WHAT?—of faces, places, ideas, stories, friends, enemies, size, words?—memory of WHAT?* Just describe the *kind* of memory you mean, and I will describe its location and name. ‘Till then I cannot.

That the phenomena of memory is not the product of a single, separate faculty, is demonstrated by the fact that there are so many *kinds* of it. If it were a *single* faculty, it could work just as well in one harness as another—could remember faces, places, words, ideas, &c. all *equally* well. This is not the case. Memory then, is not a single, separate faculty. Much less are there as many *different faculties* of memory as there are different *kinds* of it.

What then *is* Memory? Simply the reminiscence of the operations of the faculties. One faculty has to do with words, another with ideas and principles, a third with facts, &c.; and each faculty recollects those things with which it has to do. If, then, one’s faculty which has to do with principles, (Causality,) is stronger than that which has to do with incidents, (Eventuality,) he will remember principles as much better than he does facts, as his Causality is stronger than his Eventuality. So of every other faculty.

Do you not see, sir, that you put your question too soon? You should have *first* demonstrated, that the phenomena of memory was the product of a distinct mental faculty, and then demanded the phrenological name and location of that faculty.

I repeat—describe the *kind* of memory you mean, and I will tell you its name and location; or bring me a child, and I will tell you what kind of memory it possesses, and where the different kinds are located. But ask me, “where (in the head) the faculty of memory is located?” and I must answer you as the yankee answered the question, where he was born. “Why,” said he, “at Barnstable, Cape Cod, and all along shore.” Memory of *something* is located, at least all over the forehead. Understand me to introduce the yankee answer, *not* because I wish to ridicule you, or your question; for it is put to me daily, and is proper enough—but because it is too indefinite to admit of a definite answer. The same is true of every other faculty of every other system of mental philosophy. This very point shows both the weakness and obscurity of every other system

of mental philosophy, and the inimitable beauty, clearness, and naturalness of Phrenology.

I will go with you into the family where you are most familiar, and ask you, "Has that child a good memory?" You say yes—no child has a better one. I say to the mother, "can this child remember the countenances and dress of those that he saw at meeting?" "No, sir, but he can remember the whole of the sermon." I ask you if the second has a good memory? You say no. I ask the mother if she cannot recollect, with remarkable accuracy, the faces and dress of those she saw at meeting? "Yes," says the mother, "but she cannot recollect a word of the sermon." Now, sir, you were both right, and also wrong, in *both* your answers. A third child can remember only the *substance* of the sermon; a fourth, neither the substance of the sermon, nor its expression, nor the dress of those that were there, but can sing, with perfect accuracy, all the tunes she heard there, and will never forget them. But you ask *me* if this or that child has a good memory, and I will tell you in *every instance*, and with *unerring certainty*, just what *kind* of memory the child possesses.* I will do the same by every other faculty the child possesses. If you wish *ocular demonstration* instead of my assertion, choose your time, place, children, witnesses, scribe, &c. with the understanding that the result is to be published. Let the true character of the children be previously written, and their physiognomy covered. Invite Dr. Annan, and let us see whether Phrenology be "the hallucination of a moon-struck imagination." Since I appeal to *such* a test, my declaration must be admitted till it is disproved.

Yours, &c.

O. S. FOWLER.

It is fortunate that I proposed the question about memory. Many will learn what they never conceived of before. Contrary to the universally received opinion, memory is not to be called a faculty of the mind. Because Phrenologists cannot find a bump for it to repose on; they have thrown it out of the fraternity of faculties. They deny that it is a faculty because it manifests itself in a variety of ways. One man remembers persons, another colors, another friends, another enemies and therefore memory is not a faculty. Let us place this in the form of a syllogism.

Major—That is not a faculty which does not manifest itself in the same way in every person;

* See the account of the examination of two brothers, recently published in the *Chronicle*, and also as editorial in the *Lutheran Observer*. See Appendix, A.

Minor—Memory manifests itself in one person, and he remembers colors; in another, and he remembers friends; in another, and he remembers enemies: which manifestation not being alike in all three, therefore:

Conclusion—Memory is not a faculty.

Now let us see how this will apply to some of the faculties which belong to Phrenology. In Mr. F's. chart we find "Destructiveness" a faculty of the mind. Mr. F. defines it thus: "Propensity to destroy what is hurtful, to exterminate nuisances; to witness and inflict pain, corporeal and mental." According to the above syllogism, based on Mr. F's. arguments, "Destructiveness" is not a faculty, because, like memory, it is manifested differently in different persons. One person will "exterminate nuisances," and another will "witness and inflict pain, corporeal and mental." I might, by a like process, prove that every organ laid down in Mr. F's. chart, is no faculty of the mind.

Mr. F's. illustration of the operations of memory is a little amusing; "one man always remembers a friend, (Adhesiveness large,) but soon forgets an enemy; another always remembers an enemy (Destructiveness large,) but soon forgets a friend, and some never forget either. One remembers his debtors, (Acquisitiveness large,) another his creditors, (Conscientiousness large,)"—I have referred to Mr. F's. chart but cannot find that these are the functions of "Adhesiveness," "Destructiveness," "Acquisitiveness," and "Conscientiousness."—It seems that large organs not only cause memory but they cause forgetfulness.* If one have large "adhesiveness," he will remember friends but forget enemies. A man must have large "Conscientiousness" to remember his creditors. Some men remember their creditors though they do not pay their debts. Others remember creditors because they fear a prosecution—others contract debts and pay the bills when presented, yet they do not keep their creditors in mind. Again, the function of Destructiveness is to destroy, yet it causes destructive men to remember enemies and forget friends.* A man who sends in his bill to his debtor, has large "Acquisitiveness," and consequently, according to Mr. F's. chart, is predisposed "to avarice, covetousness, stinginess, cheating, fraud, theft, &c." What a blessing it would be to debtors if Phrenology be established! No man will then become a *dun* for fear of being thought a cheat, or a thief.

VINDEX.

ANSWER TO VINDEX.

Sir,—Your fourth number seems to me entirely unworthy of

* I nowhere give the least data for such an inference.

notice. Your syllogistic, scholastic method of reasoning belonged to the dark ages, and has long ago been scouted, by all correct logicians. By it can be proved directly opposites. Your criticisms on my chart really seem to me silly—like a child jingling the rattle. If a thinking community judge them strong, manly, conclusive, and calculated to overthrow Phrenology, I greatly mistake.

If Phrenology is not true, it is CONTRARY TO NATURE—to the WHOLE SYSTEM of things—contrary to ALL THE SCIENCES contrary to REVELATION, on supposition that revelation is true—contrary, in short, to *every thing*. It can then be opposed on the GRAND AND FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES of things—those principles which regulate all things, and which all admit. Why then do you attack Phrenology with *mere quibbles*? Why, if yours is the strong side, do you not take *broad ground*, and argue on GENERAL PRINCIPLES? It must be, either because you are incapable of grasping and presenting those principles, or else because they are against you—because Phrenology is *true*, is *nature*, and therefore consistent, in its *general principles*, with the *nature* of things, and with *facts*. It can be attacked by unsound syllogisms, by sophistry, by ridicule, by mere quibbles, but sir, *by nothing else*. Thus far you have not yet presented a *single general principle*, neither an anatomical, physiological, pathological, nor any other principle. Why do we hear no more about the anatomy of the brain, about which you affect to worry me so much? And let us hear no more about memory, till you have put me to the test I proposed. *That test* will completely answer your syllogism.

Yours, &c.

O. S. FOWLER.

REPLY OF VINDEK.

Mr. F. is in error when he states that syllogisms are scouted by all correct logicians. He has not mentioned one who has scouted it. I am not disposed at this time to defend syllogisms. Though they may not discover truth, they will detect sophistry, and for that purpose I used one. If Mr. F. will analyse his own mind, when he attempts to reason, he will find that he uses the syllogistic process, though not the *form*. It is related of an eminent English barrister, afterward a distinguished judge, that, on one occasion he was completely puzzled by an argument adduced by his opponent in an important case, and that he did not detect the fallacy till he went home and put it in the form of a syllogism,

VINDEK.

ANSWER TO VINDEK.

As you still insist on the validity of your syllogism, I will show its fallacy. My argument is *not* that "that is not a faculty which does not manifest itself in the same way in every person,"—but that that cannot be a single faculty which produces *different kinds of manifestations*. Now a "propensity to destroy what is hurtful—to witness and inflict pain," &c. are only *different manifestations* of the same *primitive feeling* or propensity; whereas, to recollect a *tune*, and a *mathematical theorem*, are as *toto celo* different manifestations of memory, as a tune is from a mathematical problem. The "destroying what is hurtful, witnessing and inflicting pain," &c., show themselves in the *same person*, and, other conditions being equal, with *equal strength*; whereas, memory of *tunes*, and memory of *thoughts*, do not appear with equal strength, other things being equal, in the *same person*, but appear in *different persons*. And their strength is always proportionate to the size of certain parts of the brain. There are not *different kinds* of Destructiveness, of Combativeness, of Acquisitiveness, &c. as there are different kinds of memory; although the same primitive function is exercised in reference to different objects. The following illustration will convey my idea. The organ of color recollects green, red, orange, violet, &c. and the innumerable shades and tinges produced by their combination. This is exactly analogous to the organ of Destructiveness, "destroying what is hurtful, exterminating nuisances," &c., but is *not* analogous to a single faculty remembering a *thought* and a *tune*. Having thus overthrown your major premise, your whole syllogism falls.

One faculty has to do with thoughts, and another with colors. It is *natural*—it is an *a priori inference*, that the faculty which has to do with thoughts, should *remember* thoughts; and that which has to do with colors, should remember *colors*. This theory is also perfectly coincident with facts. I challenged you to settle this point by an appeal to *facts*. *One fact* is better than a thousand syllogisms. Why do you not accept this challenge? Are you afraid of this test? Or do you think the point unworthy your notice? You make a great noise about Memory, and then either dare not test it, or consider it unworthy of testing.

I was *not* in error when I stated that syllogisms, *as such*—syllogisms in a *syllogistic form*, are scouted by all correct logicians—that they belonged to the dark ages. Where do we see the *syllogistic form* employed, the "major" and "minor"

terms, the "conclusion," the "sequiter" the "non-sequiter?" &c. They are a thousand times more likely to "puzzle" than to unpuzzle, the inquirer after truth,—to fortify, than "detect sophistry." Yours, &c. O. S. FOWLER.

I here insert a collateral discussion between an author signed C., a coadjutor of "Vindex," and myself.

FOR THE CHRONICLE.

Mr. Editor—I have been very much amused by the doubling and twisting exhibited by your phrenological controversy. But there is one point in Mr. Fowler's communication of yesterday morning, that I wish to have a little better understanding of. I allude to his observations on Memory. For instance, he says: "What, then, is Memory? Simply the reminiscence of the operations of the other faculties."

Here Memory is designated as the "*faculty*"* that simply calls up the reminiscence of the *other faculties*. Now, if this means, and only means, that by Memory the mind retains in a great degree the results of past mental operations—to my view it is in consonance with the principles of sound philosophy. In this paragraph, Memory is held up with truth, as a distinct operation of the mind—by the exercise of *one of its faculties*. But how am I to reconcile this doctrine with that contained in the rest of the paragraph which reads thus:

"One faculty has to do with words, another with ideas and principles, a third with facts, &c.; and each faculty recollects those things with which it has to do. If, then, one's faculty which has to do with principles, (Causality,) is stronger than that which has to do with incidents, (Eventuality,) he will remember principles as much better than he does facts, as his Causality is stronger than his Eventuality. So of any other faculty."

Here, from Memory's being one faculty that "simply calls up the reminiscence of *other faculties*," it would seem that each principle of the mind keeps a distinct chronicle of its own deeds—and thus instead of there being one only, there is at least thirty-three faculties for Memory. Memory at best is but a negative operation of the mind, and yet for it there are 33 faculties,—while Reason and Imagination, from whence originate those scintillations of greatness that ennoble our race, have but one poor faculty apiece been allotted to them! How is this? there is something rotten in Denmark, or this would not be. *Mr. Editor*, my object is not controversy; far from it. If Phre-

* Incorrect.

nology be true, all men ought to believe in it;—if false, it is only what thousands of equally plausible schemes have been before. I have quoted Mr. Fowler correctly, and have endeavored to draw honest conclusions therefrom, and if they have been unfavorable to Phrenology, I am not to blame;—only he and other Phrenologists must not be surprised if we will not give up the philosophy of our fathers, for whose promulgation so many mighty geniuses have lived and died,—for his, merely because it is the latest fashion, and without due investigation.

C.

FOR THE CHRONICLE.

PHRENOLOGY.

Mr. Editor—In your paper of the 18th inst. there appeared a good *verbal* criticism on one of my former numbers, signed C. It was, however, *merely* verbal, and founded *wholly* on my use of the term “*other* faculties,” instead of *mental* faculties. Except this mere *verbal* mistake, occasioned by a reference to the old theory of Memory, I make no allusion whatever to Memory as a distinct faculty, nor do I any where “designate Memory as the faculty that calls up the reminiscence of the other faculties.” Here C. misquoted. Mere verbal criticism is comparatively an easy task, and, in this instance, is substituted for *logical* criticism. He commits as great a verbal blunder in the phrase “and only means,” as I do in the phrase “other faculties.” Here, “only,” qualifies means, when it should qualify the following phrase.

His criticism would have been more just—more conclusive against Phrenology, had he picked in pieces my *analysis* of Memory, or overthrown my *argument* on that point, instead of “doubling and twisting” to show that the *lapsus linguæ* of the term “other faculties,” was inconsistent with my principle, that Memory is not a faculty.

Allow me a word about the phenomena called Memory. If it be the product of a single faculty, that faculty must of necessity be just as strong when exercised in reference to one class of facts, as when exercised in reference to another; and consequently, every one could remember every thing equally well. Is not this a fair inference? The hand is just as strong to raise a pound of wood, as a pound of lead; and why should not Memory, if it be a separate faculty, be just as strong to retain one class of facts or things, as another! But this is seldom or never the case. Almost every individual is a living witness to the contrary. Now, if Memory be a *single* faculty, there could

not be different *kinds*—could not be different *degrees* of Memory; which is not the case. But if it be the product of *several* faculties, each remembering its particular operations, there could, and naturally would, be as many different kinds of Memory as there were different faculties, and their degree of strength would correspond with the strength of the faculties, and consequently with the size of the phrenological organs. This is uniformly the case. Now, how happens it that the man who has one phrenological organ large, can recollect one class of facts, and the one who has that organ small, *cannot* remember that class of facts. If C. doubts that this is the case, I stand ready to demonstrate its truth or falsity. Let him put me himself to the test I offered to “Vindex,” in the number he criticised. *That test* is my argument, and will be worth more than all the philosophical theories about Memory, ever broached since the days of Aristotle. I repeat—*put me to the test of actual experiment*. Let us have *positive facts*, rather than vague and old *theories*. If C. will not meet me on *this* ground, I shall not notice the point further—if he will, let him settle preliminaries, call a meeting, if he pleases, and let my success or failure be as public as possible. Is not this fair, honorable, *conclusive* argument? Will C. meet me, or give up the point, that Memory is a single faculty? for one he *must* do.

O. S. FOWLER.

VINDEX'S CRITICISM ON THE CHART.

In Mr. F's. printed chart, we find that “Acquisitiveness,” when large, “predisposes to avarice, covetousness, stinginess, cheating, fraud, theft, &c.” All these traits of character belong to one organ.—But where are we to draw the line. A man may be avaricious, or covetous, or stingy, without resorting to cheating, fraud, or thieving. We may take two individuals, each having large “Acquisitiveness,” and yet their characters will be different—one will be avaricious, and the other will be a thief or a cheat. If Phrenology can come no nearer a man's character, than to say, he is either a thief, or an avaricious man, the system is of no value at all.

“No. 1—Amativeness—physical love. It originates and stimulates the sexual desire and prompts those kind attentions and obliging manners which the sexes show to each other; thus greatly promoting politeness, urbanity, refinement and social happiness.” This is a faculty common to animals of every class. Naturalists inform us that many animals have their season of love. According to Phrenology, the organ must be larger at those seasons than at others. From Mr. F's. defi-

nition we find that the same faculty, which has led soldiers to commit outrages upon the unprotected females of their enemies, is the faculty that "prompts those kind attentions and obliging manners which the sexes show to each other." Probably Romulus thought, when he permitted the outrage on the Sabine women, that he was "thus greatly promoting politeness, urbanity, refinement, and social happiness."

No. 2—Philoprogenitiveness. Love of offspring, fondness for children generally. It also creates a fondness for dolls and domestic animals, generally much larger in females than in males. Thus we learn that the same faculty which makes a mother love her offspring, makes her also love domestic animals. Perhaps that is the reason why females of a certain age, are fond of cats. As the organ is larger in females than in males, the former ought to be more fond of domestic animals than the latter. As a general rule, men are more fond of horses and dogs than women. These inconsistencies appear to be irreconcilable.

Upon looking at Mr. F's. chart, I find that though each organ is distinct from the rest, and occupies a separate portion of the brain, yet they act in companies—for example he says, "Concentrativeness, with Adhesiveness large, continues for a long time, feelings of friendship; with Combativeness or Destructiveness, full of anger or revenge; with Cautiousness, full of apprehension; with Benevolence, full of kindness, and with Comparison or Causality full, a process of reasoning." Destructiveness is a propensity to destroy—Benevolence makes one charitable. Suppose these two organs were of a size, how can a Phrenologist tell which will predominate? Organs of an equal size are not at the same time in activity. Destructiveness may be more active than Benevolence, and lead to murder—yet Mr. F. cannot say, beforehand, that a man with such a conformation will be a murderer. Acquisitiveness and Conscientiousness may be of the same size; the former may be more active than the latter, and lead to stealing—yet Mr. F. could not detect the thief beforehand. It is the same with many other organs, and yet Mr. F. says that a Phrenologist can "pronounce decisively whether a man is a murderer, a thief, or a liar."*

Mr. F. says, my "criticisms on my chart seem to me silly—like a child jingling the rattle." I am not disposed to jingle with the *rattle* any more. I have pointed out the mode, and any one with the disposition can take up the *rattle*, examine it and find out inconsistencies enough in every organ to sa-

tisfy himself, that Phrenology, as laid down by Mr. F., is the most uncertain of all systems.

VINDEK.

ANSWER TO VINDEK.

You say, "If Phrenology can come no nearer a man's character than to say he is either avaricious or a thief, the system is of no value at all." I ask what is an avaricious feeling, but a desire for property, and what is a thievish disposition but a desire for property? One is a certain desire expressed in act; the other, the same desire suppressed. The two can hardly exist separately. Now I can tell you how strong a man's *love of property is*, and is *this* of no value? Phrenology goes deeper than *mere acts*. It goes into the *secret recesses* of the soul, and measures the depth and strength, of the very *springs* of human thought and feeling. It discovers the relative strength and power of the *faculties themselves*—of the *fountains* of emotion and action. This is the peculiar prerogative—the inimitable beauty of Phrenology.

That it is the same primitive impulse which makes man kind to woman, and which leads to licentiousness, is perfectly evident—the former being the proper, the latter the perverted exercise of the faculties. It requires no great power of analysis to show that the same faculty can be exercised on the child, the doll, (its representative,) the lap dog, and the kitten. Of these animals, as well as of children, females are more fond than males. Men love their horses rather as associates than as pets. You carp about the "phrenological organs acting in companies." Who walks without using, at the same time, his feet, legs, toes, eyes, lungs and even hands—without calling into action almost every organ and nerve belonging to the body. Innumerable instances might be adduced of a like character. Indeed we perform scarce an act of our lives without the co-operation of several organs. Is it strange, then, that the *phrenological* organs should "act in companies?" It would be *very* strange, would be contrary to the *whole analogy* of nature, if these organs did not "act in companies."

On supposition that the seemingly opposite organs of Destructiveness and Benevolence are equally large, you ask, which will predominate? I answer, the one which circumstances excite most. When there is nothing to excite the former, and much to excite the latter, kindness is the result, but when injustice, or personal abuse excites Destructiveness, severity, and sometimes rage, are the consequences. *This alone*, will explain the character of those who are generally kind, obliging,

sympathetic, &c.: but who, when thoroughly provoked, are *terrible*—are truly fiendlike, and entirely beside themselves. It is thus that Phrenology, and Phrenology *alone*, analyzes, most perfectly and beautifully, those characters, and mental phenomena, which can be explained *in no other way*—which no other system of mental philosophy *can* explain.

The chart, which you effect to criticise, has been pronounced, by competent judges, “the best abstract of Phrenology extant,” and described as “having an uncommon share of mathematical precision, clearness, and definiteness,” as “embodying an immense amount of thought in a condensed form, and in a perspicuous manner,” as conveying a more clear, and definite idea of the phrenological organs, than can be any where else found, except in the large works on Phrenology. Except yourself, not a single person has, to my knowledge, said a single word against it, and a great number have recommended it in the highest terms. *It speaks for itself*. Take this chart in one hand, and any biography you please in the other, and I hazard the assertion that not a single act in the individual’s life, nor trait of his character, can be found which cannot be properly classed under one or more of the organs as described in the chart. I am aware that it has its defects, and am now preparing one altogether its superior. It was not *designed* as a system of mental philosophy, but merely to enable me to indicate on it, by means of figures in the margin, the stronger traits of character, to save the labor of writing them.

DISAGREEMENT IN MY EXAMINATIONS.

You say, “I have known Phrenologists, and *expert* ones too, who, with all their expertness, speak with considerable hesitation on some points of the system. I am not disposed to allow Mr. F. the monopoly of expertness. There is an individual in this city, who had his head examined by Mr. F. in New York, and received a chart with the relative size of the organs marked upon it. When Mr. F. came to Baltimore, the same gentleman had his head re-examined, and received a new chart from Mr. F. On comparing the two together, it was found that they agreed only in four or five organs, some of the organs were marked four and six numbers different of the two charts. Surely Mr. F. cannot be considered an exact Phrenologist, if he differ so widely within a month. Mr. F. has an *expert* assistant here. I know a gentleman who was examined by Mr. F. Yet, I will venture to assert that his assistant cannot give a chart in which the size of the organs will agree ^{with} ~~in~~ one case out of three. This proves that the system cannot ^{be} ~~be~~ practically sustained.”

This objection will doubtless make a stronger impression than any thing you have yet said. But let us examine it.

The only object of the figures I place in the margin of my chart, is to indicate, as nearly as may be, the *relative* size of the organs. The figures in one chart may be higher than those in another, and yet the *proportionate* size remain much the same. If I mark one organ 12, another 14, &c. and again mark the first organ 14, the second 16, &c. their *proportionate* size is the same, and *this* is all that my chart *professes* to give, (see explanation.) In order to present the strong points of character in more bold relief, I mark the high organs higher, and the low ones lower, here than in New York.

On the organs of Constructiveness, Coloring, Tune, and Calculation, I sometimes make mistakes, except in the case of children, where I seldom or never fail. This I have said publicly, and of course, any mistake occurring on these organs have no weight. I then propose two questions. Were not the chief mistakes on one or other of these organs? and were not those organs that were marked high in New York, marked higher here? and those that were marked low there, marked lower here?* If you answer these questions in the affirmative your argument has no weight; if in the negative, why I have made a *single* mistake. That is all.

You invite me to let my assistant try the head of a friend of yours. If he were here, I would do so, with all the readiness and confidence imaginable. When in Albany I described publicly the character of an individual, in the absence of my partner. He then described the same head, before the same audience. Our descriptions were, in all respects, *precisely* alike, except that he touched on a single point more than I did.

While my partner was in Richmond, two gentlemen staked \$40 that his second examination, would differ three figures in one of the organs from his first. He was blindfolded before the individual was introduced. *Every figure on the second chart corresponded exactly with every figure on the first*, except that one organ was marked one figure higher on the one chart than on the other. It would be impossible to conceive of much greater exactness.

You doubt whether I can describe the same character twice alike. Try me. I propose this evening to examine, publicly, a number of heads. I give you the privilege of producing any person you please, whose head I have already examined, and let him say before the audience, whether the two descriptions of character agree. If you do not choose to leave the curtain, you can act through an agent; only the audience must under-

* I have since learned that both are very generally true of the two charts.

stand that you choose the subject. If you will not try me, you must give up your ground.*

My examinations in New York were much more cursory, and of course less perfect, than here. I have also materially improved. I have been tested in this way hundreds of times, and am willing to be hundreds more. I always give the *same description of character*, the second time, that I did the first, and, in general, nearly the same *members*. While reading your last, a gentleman, whose name I can give, entered my office, whom I had examined three weeks ago. I gave him a new chart, and on dividing the sum total of the two charts by the total difference, the difference was only as one to fifty. A gentleman of Baltimore lost his chart, and after giving him the second, he declared, in the presence of a distinguished author of this city, that *every number of the second chart agreed with every number of the first*, with but one exception. The difference between them was as 1 to 125. A Mr. S. Smith, merchant in Troy, staked the price of an examination, that the difference between the first and second examinations, would be as one to eight. It was as 1 to 85. All the numbers, except five, were alike in both charts. How much more accurately is surveying done by mathematical instruments?

Now, if disagreement in *one* case goes to disprove Phrenology, this agreement in four cases goes four times as far in proof of it.

Allow me now, to try *your* "expertness." Take promiscuously from the stream, 35 pebbles, and give me, by the senses of seeing and feeling, their relative size, in a scale of numbers from 1 to 20. Do the same one hour, or three months, afterwards, as was the case in the instance you cite, and if your numbers do not differ *ten times* as much as mine, I will own—not that Phrenology is not true—but simply, that I am not *ten times* as "expert" as you are. Will you try it, or acknowledge, without trying, that your argument is weak? though you have the advantage of ten to one.

As the numbering of the organs is no necessary part of Phrenology, I may give two descriptions of character, both perfect, and precisely alike, and yet not put down *the same numbers* in both cases. It is much easier to describe the character than to transfer it accurately to the chart. Yet the chart is very useful for preserving, as nearly as may be, the result of the description given. Ask your friend—not whether the *numbers*

* At the meeting mentioned I was thoroughly tried, both with and without my eyes covered, and in the fifty or a hundred organs that I remembered, there was no material difference except in one organ. In every case, but two, the size of the organ was the same, or did not differ over two-twentieths from that previously given.

on the two charts agree, but whether the two descriptions of character agree; for *this* is the only thing with which *Phrenology*, as such, has to do. I venture this assertion, that between the two descriptions of character there is a striking, not to say perfect, similarity. *Is it not so?* If I should differ in this, which I seldom or never do, it would prove only that I was not so expert the first time as the second, or that I was more expert the second time than the first,* but it would scarcely touch the great question we are arguing—viz. whether *Phrenology* is true or false.

A physician often prescribes different, and sometimes opposite, remedies, to the same patient, under similar circumstances. Now your argument, if it proves any thing, prove that, if *ever a single physician*, has, at different times, prescribed different remedies to the same patient, in similar circumstances, *the whole science of medicine is false*—a position which no physician will admit, for scarce a single practitioner has not done the like. I doubt whether a single man of common sense would ever admit, much less *adduce*, such an argument in disproof of medicine, not to say *Phrenology*. Now the two cases are parallel. If they are not, please to show wherein the parallelism fails.

INCREASE OF THE ORGANS BY EXERCISE.

You ask, "Is an organ increased in size by constant activity, and can that increase be observed by an examination of heads?" I answer yes, to both parts of the question, and this increase can be measured by instruments, or seen on busts taken at different periods of life. And this theory is in perfect accordance with the whole process of nature, and with the fundamental principles of physiology. I should like to see the position, that the exercise of any corporeal organ, does not increase its size, questioned.

You also ask, whether, in the case of those criminals you mention, whose consciences tormented them at their first entrance on a course of crime, but afterwards ceased to trouble them, their organs of Conscientiousness diminished as they progressed in crime? I answer, unquestionably; and on precisely the same physiological principle, that the arm, when it is swung up, diminishes, both in size and strength. *Every* corporeal organ is increased by exercise, and diminished by inaction.

Yours, &c.

O. S. FOWLER.

REPLY OF VINDEX.

Again, Mr. F. states that an organ is increased in size by activity, and the increase can be observed by examination; and

* "Strange that such a difference that there should be,
"Twixt tweedle-dum and tweedle-de."

then in continuation, says: "I should like to see the position, that the exercise of any corporeal organ does not increase its size, questioned." Does Mr. F. mean that the mental organs are corporeal? If so, then the activity of the brain causes activity of the mind, and hence we have a reason why some parents shake their children for stupidity, instead of whipping them. By the latter mode they excite the *feeling*; by the former, the *mind*! Violent passions of the mind certainly do affect the body, and quicken or retard the circulation; yet we do not find that the veins and arteries are increased or diminished in size. But it is not true that a violent action of the body increases the activity of the mind; or if it be true, then we must look for a great activity of the mind in those whose whole time is spent at the treading mill. Mr. F. says his "theory is in perfect accordance with the whole process of nature, and with the fundamental principles of physiology." Comparisons drawn from *material* objects, to prove the principles which govern the immaterial mind, cannot be relied upon. It is not a principle of physiology, that the strength of an organ depends upon its size. An organ that is small, may be more powerful than one that is large. We know that by exercise, continued for a long time, the muscles of a blacksmith's arm, are first hardened and then increased in size; but this is the work of years, and the increase in size is assisted by the weight of the hammer. But the brain, which is composed of a substance different from the muscles of the arm, is not proved to be susceptible of violent motion, neither is it assisted by an external agent like the blacksmith's hammer. The brain is a soft substance which can produce but little, if any, change in the cranium, which is a hard bone. It is computed that the body undergoes an entire change once in seven years, therefore an organ must be in constant activity the whole of that period, or it will make no change in the skull.

VINDEX.

ANSWER TO VINDEX.

You ask, if I "mean that the mental organs are corporeal?" The *brain* is *certainly* a *corporeal* organ. Corporeal means, belonging to the body. The brain belongs to the body, and is therefore a corporeal organ, and of course governed by the same laws of increase and decrease that govern *other* corporeal organs. It is also the mental organ, or the organ of the mind. You say it is not true that the violent action of the *body*, increases the action of the *mind*—that exercise does not increase, nor inactivity diminish, the size of the veins and arteries. I say it is true, and appeal both to the personal experience and ob-

servation of each reader, whether, when his *body* is vigorous and active, his *mind* is not *proportionably* so; and whether, when his *body* is sluggish or drowsy, his *mind* also is not *equally* so; and whether the shaking of a drowsy child does not quicken his *mental*, as well as corporeal action! Never give a child any exercise, and see how fast his veins and arteries will grow. You say "the muscles of a blacksmith's arm are first hardened, and then increased. I say the two processes of hardening and increasing are *simultaneous*. You say that "comparisons drawn from *material* objects do not apply to the *immaterial* mind." I say that the brain, about which we argue, is just as much material, as the blacksmith's arm, and is governed by the same laws, one of which is, that its exercise causes its increase. It is for *you* to prove either that the powerful action of the mind does not produce a corresponding action of its corporeal organ, the brain, or else that exercise, while it increases the size of every other organ of the body, does *not* increase the size of the brain. All analogy is point blank against you, and with me.

You say, "that a mental organ is increased in size by constant activity, and that it* can be observed by examination, requires to be proved. Assertion alone is not sufficient. There is not a single case recorded by Phrenologists, of a head having undergone any change so as to prove that one organ has increased or diminished in size, compared with the other organs in the same head. It is now forty years since Gall first unfolded his theory to the world; and if any change had taken place in the relative size of the organs, we would have been informed of it long before this."

It is a universal *principle of nature*, that every "organ is increased in size by constant activity, and this increase of the brain can be determined just as well as that of any other corporeal organ. If "*assertion* alone is not sufficient," *analogy* and *physical demonstration* are *all* sufficient. Your "*assertion alone is not sufficient*" against *such* evidence. A certain hatter, in London, observed that educated and literary men generally required hats a size larger than those of laboring men. But the *bodies* of such men are generally *smaller* than those of laborers. *Why* this difference? We know that the exercise of any organ increases it—that thinking men exercise the brain, or mental organ, proportionably more than laborers; and that laborers exercise the body proportionably more than the mind, and of course, than the brain. The fact could not be otherwise, unless nature's laws should vary. It would require but a little Causality to demonstrate, that since the exercise of *all* the men-

* "It." What "size" or "mental organ?"

tal faculties causes the exercise, and of course enlargement, of the *whole* brain, the exercise of a *single* faculty, must cause an enlargement of that particular *part* of it by means of which it is exercised.

You say that Phrenologists have never recorded the case of a single organ having increased or diminished in size, compared with other organs in the same head, though they have had the observation of forty, (nearer sixty,) years. This "*mere assertion*" is both gratuitous and incorrect. Phrenological works abound with cases exactly in point. I take the following from the many "recorded" in the Phrenological Journal. The Causality of an eminent English astronomer, within five years after he commenced his astronomical observations, increased nearly half an inch in length, and proportionately in breadth, more than the surrounding organs. Another English gentleman had a cast of his head taken, annually, for five successive years. Meanwhile he stimulated some of the phrenological faculties, and avoided exercising others. Every successive cast showed an increase of those organs that were exercised, and a decrease of those that were restrained. The first and last casts differed so much that they would not have been recognized as casts of the same head. I had this fact from a gentleman, (an editor) who examined the busts alluded to, to whom I can refer you. Numbers more might be quoted. And yet you say Phrenologists have never recorded a case of the kind. If you have not read all the phrenological works, why do you make this "assertion?" if you have, why misrepresent them in this manner? This proves, to a demonstration, that you know comparatively nothing of the doctrine you oppose. Ignorance of this subject is, however, common to all Anti-phrenologists.

Several instances, both of increase and decrease, have fallen under my own observation. While examining the head of a gentleman in *Philadelphia*, I noticed that the organs on one side of it were larger than those on the other. He then stated that, for two years, that side of the head on which the organs were smaller, had not perspired, while the other, perspired very freely. This proves that the organs on that side which had not perspired, had not been active, and that those on the other side, had been. It follows then, either that the smaller organs became so in consequence of their inactivity, or else, that the larger ones had, in consequence of their activity, out-grown them. Either supposition proves that a mental organ is increased by constant activity, and decreased by inaction. An eminent Phrenologist examined the head of a distinguished

female editor, whose whole life had been chiefly occupied with books, and severe application to the abstract sciences. Of course, her phrenological organs of Causality, Comparison, Mirthfulness, Ideality, Language, and Eventuality, were very large, and her observing organs, very small. She was advised to leave her abstract studies, and take up Botany, Mineralogy, Phrenology, &c. in order to exercise a new class of faculties, the organs of which are located about the eye. This she accordingly did with all her might, and in *three months* there was a perceptible increase of the organs thus exercised. I have references for the last two cases. I am also perfectly certain that since I commenced the practice of Phrenology, several of my own organs, which have thereby been called into "constant activity," have very perceptibly increased, while others, that are now exercised comparatively less than before, are comparatively smaller. This point, then, is fully settled, both by *analogy*, and by PHYSICAL DEMONSTRATION, that the *exercise of a particular mental faculty, causes the exercise, and consequently enlargement, of the brain*, and of course of the skull above it, so that the *strength of any faculty* can be determined by the *size of its cerebral organ*, and the size of the cerebral organ, by the external shape of the skull. Phrenology is therefore true. If this is so, of what *momentous* importance—of what *immense* utility a knowledge of Phrenology might be to parents and teachers. They might cultivate or restrain—might stimulate or allay such organs as the case demanded, and thus make their children what they chose. Not, however, that the *nature* of children could thus be changed, but *excesses* could be prevented, and the hand of the parent directed to the identical point of excess or defect. Yes, sir, Phrenology is destined to be of greater practical utility to mankind than *any*—than EVERY other science—greater than any finite mind can imagine. And yet you oppose it! But you are pardonable; for as has been shown, you do it *ignorantly*.

Yours, &c. O. S. FOWLER

PHRENOLOGY DEPENDENT ON PHYSIOGNOMY.

You ask, "can a Phrenologist by examining the cranium, pronounce decisively whether a man is a liar, a thief, or a murderer, without reference to physiognomy?" I answer, just as well without physiognomy as with it. I will also refer you to the certificates given by the keepers of most of the prisons in Europe, which affirm that Drs. Gall and Spurzheim, in every attempt, classified the prisoners with perfect accuracy, according to their crimes. If you wish it, I will publish a few facts on this subject, or you may put me to the test, by accompanying me to a prison.

You reply, that Gall could easily determine that persons were rogues, when he saw them in prison. True—but he could not thereby determine the *class* of their crimes—whether they were sent there for stealing, for assault and battery, for murder, &c. and *this* is what Dr. Gall did. You intimate that Phrenologists determine character by the physiognomy. You know that from the time I first came to Baltimore, to this day, I have challenged disbelievers to cover the physiognomy of the subject. I have, in this city, repeatedly examined subjects before large audiences, with my eyes blindfolded, and according to the testimony of the subjects themselves, according to the testimony of all who knew them, there was a *perfect* coincidence of my description of the character, and of the character itself. One gentleman, to whom I gave large Constructiveness, stated that I had missed him there, but his wife said that this was the most correct part of the description, and he said that he had collected a great number and variety of tools, and was distinguished for his ability to draw, draught, &c. This coincides with the definition of Constructiveness given in my chart. I re-examined, blindfolded, before the Baltimore Lyceum, the head of the editor of the Chronicle. He then stated that it corresponded, *in every point*, with that previously given before an audience, at my first lecture. The first time, he was a perfect stranger to me, and the second, I knew nothing whom I was describing. And yet it is a matter of public notoriety, a fact substantiated, by the public testimony of Mr. Barnes himself, that the two descriptions agreed *in every respect*, both with each other, and with his true character. After the lecture, a gentleman produced a little boy. I said he was a thief—was cunning, deceitful, lying, haughty, stubborn, proud, ungovernable, &c. The gentleman said, “your description is perfectly accurate. Till now I have been a sceptic.” You see that *I* can detect a rogue as well in a church as in a prison. While discussing, before the Baltimore Lyceum, the question “whether Phrenology ought to be ranked among the exact sciences,” my opponent, after adducing precisely the same objections that you adduce, and in the same style, wrote the character of a Mr. Wolf, in the form of answers to questions. These questions he put to me. My answers were recorded, and compared with his, before the audience. The two agreed *perfectly*, except that he said Mr. W. had no imitation at all; I said he had it large. A gentleman who had been intimate with for him fifteen years, said he had it large. Appeal was then made to Mr. W. who said, that though he was no mimic, yet he could draw, sketch, draught, take profiles, &c. with much more than ordinary facility. I did not say he could *mimic*, for

he had but little Secretiveness. The cheering was tremendous, and the Lyceum decided, not only that Phrenology was one of the *sciences*, but that it was one even of the *exact sciences*. I can detail thousands of cases in which I have not only corrected person's opinions of each other, but even of themselves. I gave to a certain gentleman in this city, small Eventuality, and large Ideality, telling him that he could write poetry. He said that though he loved poetry, he had no talent at all for writing it. He however, tried it. His effort was completely successful, and his poem full of poetic fire. He remarked that this was his first effort, but a friend of his youth reminded him, that while young, he had written several pieces, which were copied and admired throughout the neighborhood. His small Eventuality had let the incident slip from his mind. I have his certificate that I described the character of his nephew, who is living with him, as well as, or even better than, he himself could have done.

I have said it publicly, and often repeated it, and here again repeat it, that I had even rather the physiognomy of the subject would be covered; and am perfectly willing to examine even with my own eyes blindfolded. So that, even if I do tell by the physiognomy, the *argument* that I do, has no weight; because I challenge you to remove *all possibility* of my determining character except by Phrenology.

FATALISM.

You charge me with saying, that "a Phrenologist could pronounce decisively whether a man is a liar, a thief, or a murderer;" and hence argue, that if Phrenology is true, Deity is not benevolent,—that moral accountability is destroyed,—that a child is a murderer, liar, thief, &c. before he can lift a table knife, &c. I have never made such a statement. If I have, quote the passage, *and the context*. Your whole argument, then, about Phrenology militating against the goodness of Deity,—destroying moral responsibility,—a child's being a murderer while yet in the cradle—falls; for its foundation is removed.

The paragraph of "VINDEX," on this subject, is the only one I do not quote entire. I omit it only because the objection he professes to state, is not stated in so strong and tangible a manner as I hope to be able to state it myself. See if I do not do it ample justice.

Phrenology, says the objector, necessarily destroys all free agency, and with it all moral and religious accountability. The leading doctrine of this science is, that moral action and conduct are the result of, or at least conform and agree with, the physical form of the cranium. This conformity, then, must be

the relation of *cause* and *effect*—*necessary* and not accidental. Therefore every moral agent must be ruled by this relation, and has no power whatever of deviating from it, which amounts to a full denial of free agency.

The objection, illustrated, amounts to this:—If God created one man with those organs very large, which, when large, lead to stealing, lying, quarreling, fighting, licentiousness, murdering, or vice of any kind, he is thereby forced to commit the corresponding crimes. He is not, therefore, blameable for his vices, and consequently not punishable for them, since he cannot help himself. If God created another with the moral, or intellectual organs large, no thanks to him, that he is kind, liberal, just, virtuous, intelligent, &c. for he is made so by the *shape of his head*, and not by his own free choice. The blood-thirsty Nero, and the philanthropic Howard, are alike virtuous, alike vicious, since each acted in conformity with the physical formation of his head—as God designed and created him to act. If another is created destitute of the organs of Veneration and Conscientiousness, how can he worship his Creator, or deal justly, or resist temptation, without these organs? and how can he be blamed for not doing what he cannot do? Therefore, Phrenology, if true, destroys all free agency, destroys all power of voluntary choice, and with them all accountability, all virtue, all vice, all future rewards and punishments, all morality; for Deity created the organs, and the organs produce the actions, so that sinful man is *forced to do just what he does do*. Deity is, therefore, the author of all sin.

To this objection, it is answered—

1st. It is a MATTER OF FACT, that one man *is* a Nero, and another a Howard—that one *has* a strong propensity to steal, another to deceive, another to murder, and another to give. One *is* timid, another quarrelsome—one talented, another foolish, one inclined to virtue, another prone to vice, and others again are pre-eminent, both for their virtues and their vices. That certain vicious propensities *do exist*, and are *very strong* is an ABSOLUTE MATTER OF FACT—a fact that every where stares every observer of human nature, *full in the face*. Almost every newspaper is blackened with the horrid detail of some cold-blooded murder—of some fatal duel, or a manslaughter, or a robbery, or a rape, or some other shocking, or disgusting crime. A gentleman recently entered my office, desiring me to tell him the *whole* truth. At the close, he remarked that the description was perfect, only that one *marked*, one *predominant* trait of character had been omitted. “And I can tell you what that is, sir,” said I, “you have a very strong propensity to steal.”

"You are right, sir," replied he, "yet you and I are the only persons that know it. Notwithstanding all my efforts to rid myself of it, the propensity still exists, and is well nigh irresistible." A lad was recently brought me, whom I described as a lump of wickedness, yet talented. His uncle remarked, that he never saw his equal, either for depravity or talent. I have seen—every observer of human nature must also have seen, similar cases in abundance. Indeed, is there a single individual who is not himself an instance—that is, who has not some vicious propensity—some "easily besetting sin?" I repeat that the objection lies against ABSOLUTE MATTERS OF FACT. Now what difference does it make whether a certain vicious propensity is, or is not, always accompanied with a certain prominence on the head, and another virtuous or vicious propensity, accompanied with another prominence on another part of it. The objection lies, *not* against one's having the *phrenological organs*, which are mere *physical signs* of the propensities but against his having the VICIOUS PROPENSITIES THEMSELVES—not against the *phrenological explanation* of these facts, but against the FACTS THEMSELVES—against the *system of nature*—against the *government of God*. Since then your objection *really* lies against the *existence of vicious propensities*, and since daily observation, if not personal experience, forces you to admit the existence of these propensities; you are obliged to admit the very thing to which you object. And since you admit, equally with myself, the very thing to which you object, it belongs to you to answer your own objection, rather than to me. But further. If Phrenology did *not* decide that one man is a liar, another a thief, a third virtuous, a fourth talented, &c., it would not correspond with facts, and therefore could not be true. This correspondence with facts, rather proves than disproves, Phrenology.

How man came by these propensities, how far he is depraved, in what the essence of depravity consists, &c. are theological rather than phrenological questions. I say nothing about them.

2d. Divine agency either does or does not influence human actions—either *is* or is *not* concerned in bringing about events. If this is *not* the case, Deity does not rule, and has no hand at all in any thing that transpires among men. But if Deity *does* rule,—if *Divine* agency is efficient in forming human character and bringing about events, just so far as this is the case, so far *human* agency cannot be efficient. That is, so far as *God* rules, so far *man* cannot rule; so far as *Divine* agency forms human character, and influences human conduct, so far, *free* agency cannot do it. So far, then, as your objection lies at all

against Phrenology, it *also* lies, and with *equal weight*, against Deity's having *any hand at all* in *any thing* that concerns human character and conduct. It makes not the least difference whether Deity forms human character, and influences human conduct by direct supernatural agency, by circumstances, or by means of phrenological organs. Your objection lies against Deity's having *any hand at all, either in forming human character, or in influencing human conduct*, or in bringing about events.

What, then! Mr. objector, do you really design wholly to reject Divine agency in the formation of human character, and in the management of human concerns? and, by denying that God gives any bias whatever to human character, *virtually* deny that he *rules*? If you answer no, drop your objection at once; if you say yes, it is horrid blasphemy, and downright atheism. One of these you must do. Choose for yourself. But if you admit free agency, which your objection presupposes; and also that God rules, which you must do or be an atheist, then answer your own objection: for it lies just as much against what you admit, as it does against Phrenology; and an objection is always considered as fully answered, when shown to lie against what the objector himself admits.

"But," you reply, "you do not answer the objection by throwing it back at *me*—you do not get yourself *out* of the snare by getting *me into* it." True, sir, but I thereby shut *your* mouth. First get out of your own snare, which you have laid for me, and you will thus get me out of it. That is, answer your own objection as it applies to *matters of fact*,—to the *superintendence of Deity*, and you will have answered it as it applies to Phrenology. Till you *do* thus answer it, it belongs to you to drop it, since by urging it at all, you virtually urge it also against the works and the government of God, and may settle your difficulty with your Maker. But read on, and see how handsomely Phrenology will help us *both* out of the snare.

3. These phrenological organs are only the *corporeal instruments* by means of which the mind exercises various mental functions. As the brain is the *general* organ of the mind;—so these several portions of the brain are the *particular* organs of the several faculties. These organs grow and increase by exercise, just as the hand, and every other corporeal organ does. The right hand is generally larger than the left, only because it is exercised more. And, as by seeing how much the right hand is larger than the left, you can determine how much more it has been exercised; so by seeing how much the organ of Benevolence is larger than the organ of Cautiousness, you can determine how much more the organ, and of course the

faculty of Benevolence, has been exercised more than the organ, and consequently faculty, of Cautiousness. These organs, then, are only EFFECTS of the exercise of certain mental faculties, and not their *causes*—and the size of each organ is only a physical index, showing how much the free agent has chosen to exercise the corresponding faculty or propensity. Large Acquisitiveness, instead of *forcing* its possessor to steal, is only an external sign, showing how much the subject has chosen to exercise a thievish propensity. Large Destructiveness, instead of compelling, or even urging, its possessor to murder and revenge, only shows the strength of his murderous revengeful feeling. The *size of any organ*, then, is itself determined by the *strength of the corresponding faculty*, instead of the strength of the faculty being determined by the size of the organ.

True, if an organ is very large, its corresponding faculty or propensity is proportionably and spontaneously more active, and often well nigh uncontrollable. But the subject had no right whatever to indulge it, and thus increase its strength. In *this chiefly* lies his guilt. The strength of the depraved propensities is in proportion to their indulgence. His guilt is also in proportion to the same indulgence—that is, his guilt is in proportion to the strength of his depraved propensities. Are the desires of the libertine, the thief, the murderer, &c. the less criminal because they have been stimulated, and indulged, and thus increased, till they are now too clamorous, too powerful to be controlled? By no means; but the stronger these depraved desires, the greater their possessor's guilt. So it is with the phrenological organs. They are not inordinately large unless the corresponding faculties have been inordinately indulged, and this indulgence is the clearest, the *strongest possible* proof, of the subject's guilt. It follows then, that very large Destructiveness, Acquisitiveness, Secretiveness, Amativeness, &c. so far from excusing the murderer, the thief, the hypocrite, the libertine, &c. are only PHYSICAL WITNESSES of *their guilt*.

If an individual wishes to reduce the size of an organ, let him cease exercising the corresponding faculty, and it is done. Swing up your arm, which you have made large and strong by exercise, and it will soon become small and feeble, by inaction. So, swing up any organ, that is, cease to exercise the corresponding faculty, and the pressure of the air on the skull, which equals fifteen pounds to the square inch, will soon remove the protuberance. This is not all theory. It is proved by *actual experiment*, by *physical demonstration*. One of the facts stated on page 35, is in point. It is a matter of fact, that as old age advances, the feeling of Amativeness generally decreases, and disappears sooner than the other faculties. The same

is also true of the phrenological organ. Both the function, and also the organ, appear later, and disappear sooner, than those of the other faculties, and their appearance, strength, and departure, keep pace with each other.

And if an organ is small, say that of Conscientiousness, or Veneration, this deficiency only proves, *not* that the free agent *could* not be just, or worship his Maker, but simply that he *did* not and *would* not do it. Every individual has more or less of every organ given him. He can then, by exercising what Conscientiousness and Veneration he has, obtain more—can, by “occupying one talent,” increase it to “five talents.” But if he neglects to exercise what Conscientiousness and Veneration he has—if he “buries his one talent in the earth,” “even what he has, will be taken from him,” and he, for his guilty misimprovement of the one talent, be justly “cast out into outer darkness.” True if he has but small Veneration, and another has the organ large, he cannot worship his Creator with all the fervor, and heart-felt devotion that the other can. Nor is this required of him; for “to whom much is given, of him much will be required.”

Every individual, then, is guilty, *not* for any excess or deficiency of his phrenological *organs*, but the excess or deficiency of the corresponding *propensities*, and of course, for the over indulgence or neglect of those propensities. As the organs grow by exercise, and are the *effects* rather than causes, of the exercise of their corresponding faculties and propensities, an individual is just as guilty for having depraved propensities, and with them large corresponding phrenological organs, which are mere physical signs, showing how much he has chosen to indulge these depraved propensities, as for having these depraved propensities, *without* the corresponding organs. So far as Phrenology is concerned, he is left just as free to act with organs as without them—to cultivate one organ, or class of organs as another; and perfectly free to cultivate any organ to any extent. What greater scope can the most strenuous advocate of free agency desire? This corresponds exactly with your own favorite doctrine of free agency, since it leaves every man free to determine his own character, and puts into his hands the power of giving, to a greater or less extent, just such a shape to his head as he chooses. I entirely mistake, or this objection is fairly stated and fully answered.

“But,” continues the objector, “did not God originally impart to one individual more of one faculty and less of another, so that the exercise of those faculties in that proportion in which it was originally given, caused, in one, a large development of the organ of Benevolence, and a small development of the or-

gan of Destructiveness; and in another the contrary organization? Did not the Creator, for instance, originally impart to the pirate Gibbs, a large measure of the faculties of Destructiveness and Acquisitiveness? to Howard, of Benevolence? to Newton, of Causality and Observation? so that each became what he was, and had the corresponding phrenological organization, in consequence of exercising his faculties in that proportion in which they were originally given? You thus only throw the objection still farther back than the exercise of the faculties, but do not yet fully meet it."

How much more of the faculties of Destructiveness and Acquisitiveness were originally given to Gibbs,—of Benevolence to Howard,—of Causality and Observation to Newton, &c., Phrenology does not pretend to decide; as it nowhere attempts to account for the *origin* of phenomena, but only to explain them. That there exists among men a heaven-wide difference, and that this difference embraces every conceivable variety of character, disposition, and talent, is an *absolute matter of fact*. Now this difference *must* be either inherent in our nature, and the original design and creation of the Deity himself, or else the product of circumstances. If you admit that in the creation of man, *God* makes this difference, you urge, against the works of Deity, the very difficulty which you urge against Phrenology, and may therefore settle it with your Maker. But if you say that it is the product of circumstances, you must allow that these circumstances are under the control of the Deity: so that, say what you will, it must be allowed that this difference among men—this endless diversity of character, is the product, either directly, or through the medium of circumstances, at least in part, of Divine agency—that, either at the original creation of the faculties, or by circumstances,—by means of phrenological organs, or in some other way, God gives more or less bias to human character. To urge this objection, then, is to quarrel with the government of God. You may urge it, then, as much as you please. But if this difference were all the product of circumstances, similar circumstances would always produce similar characters; and opposite circumstances, opposite characters—on the principle, that like causes produce like effects. Yet the reverse is often true. Similar circumstances often produce opposite characters and talents, and opposite circumstances similar characters. You must then admit that this difference is made under the superintending direction of Deity. And if you admit this, you admit the very theory to which you object. So far as Deity has any hand at all, either directly or through the medium of circumstances, in producing this difference, so far Divine agency foregoes and

cramps human agency, and so far your objection lies, but no farther. That is, just so far as God rules, so far your objection lies against his ruling, but no farther, and against nothing else. So far, then, as you urge this objection, so far you "charge God foolishly," and may settle it with your Maker. And mark this, that your objection lies with as much weight against Deity's making this difference by means of circumstances, as by means of developments on the cranium. *It lies against Deity's making ANY difference among men—against his giving ANY bias in any way to human character—against his having any influence at all among men—that is, against his ruling.*

That there should be an original difference among men, is perfectly coincident with the whole system of nature. Do you ever see two faces, or even features precisely alike? Search throughout the immense foliage of the forest, the waving fields—indeed, search throughout all nature, and can you find in it two leaves, two twigs, or *any* two substances exactly and precisely alike? Diversity and variety, characterise all nature. And is *man* an exception? By no means. His features, his talents, his inclinations—indeed all things pertaining to him, show both an original difference, as well as similarity, in the formation of his mind. If there were no difference among men—if all were cast in the same mould, and disposed to think alike, and act alike, and talk alike, and do every thing alike, what a stagnant sea, life would be! No variety! no diversity of character! That must be a most unenviable world in which there was no variety, against which your objection did not lie!

4. "But," you say, "since we see every shade of character, and every degree of depravity; and vastly more of virtue than vice—of wickedness than purity—and since Deity made all this difference, the conclusion is inevitable that he, at least, laid the foundation of all the wickedness that exists; that he made all the difference between a Howard and a Gibbs, and as he made this difference, there is no more virtue, no more vice, in the one than in the other. Thus far you have only admitted the objection, and that in all its bearings. You admit that which destroys free agency, and moral accountability."

And so do you, Mr. objector, that is, if I do. According to the rules of debate, it is your duty, since you urged the objection, and admit what you urge it against, to answer it. My next reply will however, help us both entirely out of the fog.

5. I rely *chiefly* on the following, as the conclusive reply to this objection. It is a fundamental principle of Phrenology, that **EVERY FACULTY IS ORIGINALLY GOOD, and its PROPER EXERCISE, VIRTUOUS.** Then all vice, and all sin, are the *excess* or

perversion of some *good faculty*. I will instance the worst case that can be found. The faculty of Destructiveness, which, when perverted, leads to murder. On analysing it, we find it to be simply a propensity to destroy, and inflict pain. Without this propensity, man could never fell the forests, destroy those plants and animals that are prejudicial to his happiness, extirminate nuisances, punish the guilty, make himself feared, and defend himself. Without this, he would be a tame milk-and-water sop, so tame, so chicken-hearted, that he could be abused with impunity. But this organ, so useful, so absolutely necessary, even to man's *existence*, degenerates, when perverted, into sternness, harshness, violence of temper, rage, revenge, murder, &c. Yet these are the *abuses*, and not the legitimate use of the faculty. Now, no matter how strong the propensity is, *provided it is properly employed and controlled*.

An illustration. There lives beyond a certain marsh, which is infested with beasts of prey, a poor starving family. Benevolence prompts you to carry them food, to relieve their distress. But without a weapon of defence, the wild beasts will destroy the food, and you with it. There is then put into your hands a sword, which is analagous to the organ of Destructiveness. Now, as you are not obliged, because this sword is ever so sharp, ever so destructive, to thrust it through the heart of every one you meet; so be the faculty of Destructiveness ever so powerful, you are not therefore obliged to abuse it to the injury of others. By no means. Let your sword rest in its scabbard, till circumstances demand its exercise—till your food is attacked, and then mow down those savage beasts, or still more savage men, that would rob you. And as, when the exercise of the sword is demanded, the keener and more destructive it is, the better; so the more powerful the organ of Destructiveness, the better: provided you make a proper use of it. Indeed it is often, if not *generally* impossible to be benevolent without the aid of Destructiveness. The happiness of society absolutely *demand*s the punishment of those that disturb it. But you cannot punish without the exercise of Destructiveness. There is just as much virtue in punishing the guilty, as in relieving the distressed—in the exercise of Destructiveness, where it is called for, as in that of Benevolence, where it is called for.

So of Acquisitiveness, which desires property. Without this desire, who would lay up in health, for sickness; in the vigor of life, for old age? Who would build cities, enclose and cultivate fields, engage in commerce, make books, or accumulate property of any kind? It is this organ that brings within our reach most of the comforts, and even luxuries, of life. It is more from *pure instinct*, than reason, that man lays up that

property which enables him to feed the poor, relieve distress, spread religion, and promote human happiness in ten thousand ways. But this same propensity to acquire, also leads to stealing, covetousness, and, with large Destructiveness, to oppression. Yet these are the *abuses* of a faculty, the proper exercise of which is both highly beneficial, and even *absolutely necessary*, to the well being, and even *existence*, of society. The same is true of every other organ; so that virtue and vice consist, *not* in the *faculties themselves*, which God made, nor in their relative strength, but in their *proper* or *improper exercise*, and this depends on the volition of the free moral agent.

And not only is every faculty originally good, but every faculty can be turned, either to a good or to a bad account, according to the volition of the subject; and one organ just as well as another. Any small organ can be abused, any large one perverted, and *vice versa*, according to the volition of the subject. Small or large reasoning organs can be employed to prove Infidelity, or Christianity—in the nobler pursuits of science, or in gratifying mere sensual appetites. Veneration can be employed as well in Pagan, as in Christian worship, and produces both bigotry and sincere devotion. Benevolence, Conscientiousness, and every other organ, can be perverted, and then its exercise, becomes vice. A good endowment of the propensities, is a *sine qua non*—an indispensable requisite to a virtuous character. One without them is so effeminate, so puerile, that he cannot be efficient or energetic, though possessed of high intellectual and moral endowments. A man may be as virtuous in the exercise of the propensities, as in that of the moral faculties or intellect. True, the virtue arising from the proper exercise of the propensities, may not be so elevated in its character, yet is virtue still. The proper exercise of love, be it ever so strong, is equally as virtuous, as that of devotion, almsgiving, or any logical investigation. Who does not admire the strength and tenderness of woman's love, as the most virtuous trait in her character? As even more so than kindness or intellect?

In this view of the subject, Deity never did make, and, till the nature of the faculties are changed, never *can* make a bad head, or create a bad man. Phrenology, then, while it wholly exonerates Deity, throws the whole guilt of sin upon the committer of it, and, instead of excusing the moral agent, weighs him down with immeasurable responsibility. Instead of diminishing, it greatly *enhances* the guilt of the sinner. He takes good organs and makes a bad use of them; and is therefore a hundredfold the more guilty. He has no right to pervert his nature, and prostitute heaven's richest gifts. Let him act as Deity made him to act, and he is perfect, be his head of any

shape whatever. In this view of the subject, Phrenology not only does not diminish moral responsibility, and the guilt of sinful actions—not only does not lead to fatality, but even furnishes an answer to those that urge this objection against the Christian religion. Suppose the following interview between a Christian, an Infidel, and a Phrenologist.

The Deist names the most depraved character imaginable—say that of the pirate Gibbs—who murdered 400 human subjects, ravished, and then horribly murdered, those defenceless, imploring females that fell in his way;—and says to the Christian, “Did not God make this wicked wretch, and make him too, with all his vicious propensities?” “Yes,” must be the reply. “And does he not, according to your doctrine, punish him for his crimes?” “Certainly.” “That is, Deity creates mankind depraved, and then punishes him eternally for being depraved. Surely the licentious Jupiter of the Romans, is far preferable to the tyrannical God of the Christian. Away with a Deity and a doctrine so revolting to common sense and common justice.” The Christian appeals to revelation; but this the Deist rejects. Let the Christian say what he will, it is utterly impossible to wrench this powerful weapon entirely from the hand of the Deist. But the *Phrenologist* does this effectually and completely, by saying, “True, God gave to Gibbs large Combativeness, Destructiveness, Acquisitiveness, &c.; yet these organs, so far as God is concerned, were created good, given for a good object, and are absolutely necessary to his happiness. But he prostrated these originally good faculties, to a bad purpose; shamefully abused and perverted them, and instead of employing them as his Maker designed, in promoting his own happiness, and that of others—he so abuses them as to make himself depraved, and others most miserable. He had no right, whatever, to turn his originally good faculties, to a bad account; and for doing this, he, and he alone, is guilty, and of course punishable.”

The objector may now carp as much as he pleases; but let him remember, that either of the above answers completely shuts his mouth. Let him remember, that his objection lies, not only against *matters of fact*, but against one having the *depraved* PROPENSITY, or rather against any man having ANY propensity whatever, either good or bad—that so far as it lies at all, it lies against God’s ruling; against his having any agency at all in forming human character, and that because he has this agency—that every man is perfectly free to give to his head any shape he pleases,—and that every organ is good, and its proper exercise, virtuous. Now if Phrenology’s leading to fatalism, would prove it untrue—its leading from fatalism, proves IT TRUE. The objection is then favorable to its truth.

Yours, &c. O. S. FOWLER.

MATERIALISM.

The objection that Phrenology leads to Materialism is also very generally and very ignorantly urged against it. Those who urge it do not even *pretend* to show how materialism follows from phrenological principles. Nor are they able to do this. Yet they cry *materialism, materialism*. Some, however, pretend to say that Phrenology makes mind so dependent on matter, and so much under its influence, that if it is true, mind must be, like matter, material, and therefore not immortal. Let it however be remembered that mind is somehow associated with matter—and influenced by it. We know nothing whatever about mind only as it speaks through corporeal organs—through the animated cheek, the flashing eye, the rolling tongue, the firm nervous tread, the fierce, the benignant, the humorous look, or in some other similar way. Is mind connected with matter, and does it act on matter? If not—but we *know it does* and even sympathises with it. Disturb the corporeal organization and you *equally* disturb the mental. Let the *body* be vigorous and active and the *mind* also is *equally* so, but let lassitude, and debility, and weakness prostrate the body, and the mind is also and proportionably prostrated. Inflammation the brain, and you lash up the mind to raging madness—disorganize the corporeal functions, and you *equally* disorganize the mental functions also.

Now if materialism follows from these facts; or follows from the fact that mind is closely connected with organized matter, and in part controlled by it, be it so. Materialism therefore *must* be admitted. But if this is *not* the case why charge materialism upon Phrenology, more than upon *every* system, both of physics, and of metaphysics. If Phrenology is liable to the charge of materialism, anatomy and medicine, and every existing system of mental philosophy—yea, even the *Bible itself*, are also liable to the same charge, for they all, equally with Phrenology, allow the connection of mind with matter.

Every existing system of mental philosophy proceeds on this fundamental principle that the *brain is the organ of the mind*. Phrenology also proceeds on the *same* fundamental principle. The chief difference between the two is that while the former makes the brain, as a whole, the general organ of the mind, Phrenology makes one part of it the organ of one mental faculty, and another of another. Now I ask any candid mind how much more of materialism there is in the principle that every mental faculty uses the *whole* brain, for *every* mental function, than there is in the principle that each mental faculty performs its function by a particular part of it. In both cases the mental function is exercised by means of the brain. The objection, so far as it has any force, lies *against the mind using the brain AT ALL*—and also against the mind being at all connected with, or influenced by, any part of the body.

The objection, if it has any weight is wholly at war with facts. For one, I had rather *follow facts*, without saying any thing at all about materialism, then to reject facts, pathological and anatomical, as well as phrenological, at the mere hue and cry of materialism. Let any man construct an argument that Phrenology leads to materialism, and I will employ the same argument, substituting the science of medicine, or Brown's, or Stewart's, or Read's, or Des Cartes', or any other system of mental or moral philosophy for Phrenology, and prove, by the very same process of argumentation, that each of them, equally with Phrenology, leads to materialism. So that believers in these doctrines had better beware, lest, in proving materialism upon Phrenology, they *also* prove it upon themselves—the very thing they are wishing to avoid.

But the mind's acting on matter, and employing it in the production of thought and feeling, no more proves that it is material, because its corporeal instrument is material, than the animated hand's using an inanimate tool, proves that since the tool is inanimate, the *hand* must also be inanimate. The brain is doubtless to the mind, what the tool is to the hand—merely its material instrument, but no more like it in its nature and essence than the lifeless tool is like the living hand that uses it.

It belongs to our opponent to prove, not only that Materialism is inseparable from Phrenology, but that this objection is *peculiar to Phrenology*, more than to other systems of philosophy. This never has been done, and I venture to say, never can be done.

FORTUNE-TELLING.

I cannot but notice, also, the foolish objection, that "Phrenology is a species of fortune-telling." By fortune-telling is generally meant a prediction of future events. Now Phrenology has nothing to do with *events*, but only with *characters, talents, dispositions, &c.* No man of common sense sees another, without forming *some* idea of his character. The Phrenologist does the same thing. True, the one does it by the shape of the face, the other by the shape of the skull; but as both *do the same thing*, and do it *by the same means*, (the shape of some things pertaining to the individual,) it follows that if the *Phrenologist* is a fortune-teller, every man, either of common sense or of common observation, is also a fortune-teller. If this is all that is meant by it, I should glory in being called an *expert* fortune-teller. But you apply the wrong *terms*. Call it *character-telling, talent-telling, disposition-telling*, and you speak properly; but call it *fortune-telling*, and you only show that you have not understanding enough to know the difference between *fortune-telling* and *character-telling*.

CHANGE OF HEART.

It is also objected to Phrenology, that it is at war with the Bible doctrine of a change of heart.

As though the objector should say, "The Bible must be admitted till it is disproved. That describes a certain change of character, which is effected by divine agency, or the spirit of God. Numbers in the community have experienced this conversion, and evince a thorough—a *radical* change of character and conduct, at home and abroad—among their neighbors, and in all their dealings and intercourse with men. Before this, they were dishonest, but are now honest;—before, stingy, now, liberal;—before, ill-natured and tiger-like, now, benignant and lamb-like. These are *facts*, and *must be admitted*, for they are apparent to all. Now does this change produce a change in the phrenological organs? Does one organ, that of Benevolence, for instance, suddenly rise, and that of Destructiveness, suddenly sink? Certainly not. How then can Phrenology be consistent with this fact of a change of heart? One fact is always consistent with every other fact; and as this *change of heart* is a fact, Phrenology cannot be, for it is inconsistent with facts."

As this objection seems insuperable to most professors of religion, who are as respectable as perhaps any class of citizens, I shall answer it accordingly. This point is of vital importance either to Christianity or Phrenology. I am not, as a Phrenologist, bound to admit a change of heart; yet as an individual, I am *not at all* disposed to question it, and even hope I have experienced it. I have also experienced the truth of Phrenology, and can see no clashing between the two. I also think I

can clearly demonstrate, on phrenological principles, not only the existence of Deity, but a *future state*, and also a future state of *rewards and punishments*. Believers in the Bible are generally afraid of Phrenology, though its *fundamental principles* accord perfectly with those of revelation.

A change of heart is then admitted. But what is the *character* of this change? It is *not* a change either of the corporeal or mental *faculties* of the subject, neither of the *nature* nor *relative strength* of those faculties. If he had a strong mind *before*, he has *as strong* a mind afterwards, and *vice versa*. His *peculiarities* of mind, thought, and feeling, remain the same. If he had a strong memory of faces, or places, or incidents, before, he has the same afterwards. If he had a poor one, of these things before, and a good one of ideas, or principles, or tunes, he has the same now, only that the *class* of ideas, principles and tunes, on which he prefers to exercise these faculties, are changed. Now, as the relative strength of the *faculties* of the subject are not at all altered, there is no call for a change in the relative size of the *organs*. Divine agency has changed—*not the nature of the faculties*: (for that would prove that the work of Deity is not perfect, and consequently that Deity is imperfect, and of course that Deity is no Deity;) nor altered their *proportionate strength*—but has merely given to the faculties, *as they originally were*, a *new direction*.

An illustration will make the point clear. A steamboat, which was made perfect and beautiful throughout, is being propelled down the river, by the power of steam. The rudder is turned. The same boat is *now* propelled *up* the river, *by the same power*, and by means of the *same apparatus*. The *boat* is not changed; for it was by supposition made perfect; the nature of the steam is not changed, nor is the character or proportionate strength of any one thing about the boat changed. This is not necessary. The boat was perfect before. The only trouble was that it had taken the wrong direction. Its *direction*, *merely*, is altered; and that by means of the co-operation of the boat herself, and her commanders. So it is in the matter of conversion. The sinner is sailing smoothly down the rapid current of sin and worldly pleasure, towards the opening gulf of endless perdition. Divine agency arrests him, and changes *not* the *nature* of the *thinking faculties themselves*, but merely the *direction* of the thoughts produced—*not* the nature of the *propelling powers themselves*, but the *drift and current of the feelings that flow from* those powers, by setting before them a different object to stimulate and occupy those powers.

The analogy of the steamboat, does not hold good throughout; for man is a moral agent, the steamboat a mere machine. It however holds good so far as I have occasion to apply it. Men are depraved—*not* because they have *depraved faculties*, but because they make a *depraved use* of *good faculties*.

You allude to a “*sudden*” change. So far as the change is sudden, it is not a change, either of *faculties*, or of their *relative strength*. This change of the *proportionate strength* of the faculties is *gradual*. The man whose besetting sin before conversion, was an inordinate craving for money, has the same inordinate craving afterwards, with this difference merely, that it is restrained, by the grace given him at conversion, from breaking out into overt acts of wickedness. The same is true of the passionate man—of the ambitious man, &c. Paul speaks of “warring against our lusts,” and the Bible everywhere holds out the idea that victory over our depraved propensities must be gradual, and can be obtained *only by long continued and laborious effort*—by watching and

praying, and sore self-denial. The Christian experience is compared to the "rising light, which," from a feeble glimmering stream in the east, "groweth brighter and brighter till the perfect day"—"to a grain of mustard seed, which," from the smallest of seeds, "becomes a great tree," plainly implying that so far as the *relative strength of the faculties* are changed, so far the change is *gradual*. I ask every true Christian if he is not *obliged* to hold in with a heavy rein, those propensities, that before predominated, and if a *long time* is not requisite effectually to subdue "those sins that most easily beset him" before, so that their instinctive promptings are not felt! By the time, then, that he has subdued his *propensities*, or altered the *relative strength of his faculties*, the *organs*, and also *protuberances*, will have time to adjust themselves accordingly.

PHRENOLOGY CONSISTENT WITH CHRISTIANITY.

It is also objected to Phrenology, that it promotes infidelity, is anti-christian in its tendency, and contrary to the doctrines of revelation. This charge I fully deny. Phrenology, so far from leading to infidelity, is point blank against it; and so far from contradicting the general principles and features of the Bible, and the Christian religion, perfectly harmonizes with those principles, and even goes far to establish them.

The Bible presupposes the existence of a God. Phrenology presupposes, and even proves the same thing; and also that it is the duty of man to worship him. The argument is this: The organ of Veneration has to do *wholly* with worship, and *chiefly* with the worship of *Deity*. Now reason says that it is utterly inconsistent with nature and with facts, that there should be a faculty which inclines to the worship of Deity, without there being also a Deity to be worshipped. As an eye necessarily presupposes the existence of objects to be seen, and its being adapted to take cognizance of the qualities of objects, presupposes and *necessarily implies*, the existence of those qualities—as the stomach being adapted to the digestion of food, presupposes the existence of that food; and as the adaptation of one thing to another necessarily implies, and consequently proves the existence of the thing to which it is adapted, so the fact that a faculty is given to man for worshipping Deity, necessarily implies, and conclusively proves, the existence of Deity. *Nature never falsifies*. Why, I ask, is there an organ for the worship of Deity, unless there is a Deity to be worshipped?

The existence, however, of the *faculty* and of the *inclination* to worship, is proved without Phrenology, is fully established by the religious history of "every nation, and family, and tribe under heaven." Man is *emphatically* a religious animal. This passion often swallows up, or at least directs every other, and sometimes produces madness. Do you doubt the existence of the faculty of *Veneration*—of veneration for *Deity*? Take your stand in the midst of the rolling tide, the dashing waves, the raging winds, "the thunderings and the lightnings" of heaven, and say, do you—*can* you resist the strong out-breakings of the faculty of Veneration? Who can sail on the bosom of the sparkling lake?—who gaze upon the roaring cataract?—who ascend the mountain top, or the towering steepie, and survey the verdant, the beautiful, the splendid, or the sublime scene before him, without having his whole soul wrapped in pure devotion, and kindled to intensity of worship—not for the stars of heaven, or the objects that excite this emotion—but for some unknown something that sits enthroned among them and displays his glory

by them. Who can examine the flowers of the field or the inimitable beauty of the works of creation, the anatomy of his own physical frame, the wonderful phenomena produced by what we call mind?—who, I say, can examine nature's works, without being filled with *worship*, as well as admiration, not for the things themselves, but for the *author* and the cause of all these things.

I repeat that the existence of a faculty and a tendency to worship, and to worship Deity, is beyond all question an original, constitutional part of man's nature. Nature never falsifies. Nature says there is a God, by inclining us to worship God. Therefore, there is a God. Now is it from *Phrenology alone*, that we derive that which makes the argument *absolutely conclusive*? Without Phrenology, we know that the *faculty* of Veneration exists, but this affords **PHYSICAL DEMONSTRATION**, and makes it **ABSOLUTELY CERTAIN**, that the sentiment of Veneration for Deity is a *constituent part of our nature*, an *ingredient in man's mind*. Since then we derive the sentiment of Veneration from the deep and unalterable principles of human nature; since these principles are always consistent with *matters of fact*, Phrenology makes the position, that there is a God, **ABSOLUTELY CERTAIN**, from **PHYSICAL DEMONSTRATION**.

Hope is also another principle or part of human nature, a faculty of the human mind. And as hope looks forward to a future state, it follows that there is a future state. All nations in all ages have looked forward to an existence beyond the grave. Phrenology tells us *why* they have thus anticipated a future state, shows that such anticipations are a *part of our nature*—and flow from the *constitutional structure of the mind*. Why this *hope* of a future state, unless there is a future state to answer it. Would our *nature* belie us? If it be objected that "some disbelieve in a future state, and this destroys the argument," I answer, the fact that some have too little hope to create this conviction, no more proves that it is not a part of our nature, than the fact that some have very little love proves that love is not a part of our nature. Phrenology says that "to hope for a future state is a part of our nature." Reason then replies, "Therefore there is a future state."

Conscientiousness has to do with the right and wrong of actions and feelings—with morality and immorality, with justice and injustice. By the same process of reasoning is established the existence of abstract principles of right, before which conscience arraigns our actions and feelings, condemning or acquitting according as they do or do not conform to a certain standard of right. Conscientiousness, however, does not settle what this standard is. The other organs do that, and hence there would naturally be as many *different standards* of right as there are different phrenological organizations. But as Conscientiousness has to do with *some* standard of right, it prove the *existence* of some standard. Else why any thought about right and wrong, or any faculty that takes cognizance of this quality of actions. It also condemns as punishable those actions that do not conform to the given standard, and approves as rewardable those that do. This proves the existence of rewards and punishments. The pains to which we are liable in consequence of a violation of natural and organic laws, also prove the same thing.

But hope looks forwards to a *future state* for the *full* reward of virtuous conduct, proving that virtuous actions are rewarded in *another state* of existence. Hence, the almost universal belief in a state of future bliss. We also know that it is human nature to assign a place of future punishment to the wicked, as well as of happiness to the righteous. Phrenology shows that this impression is also derived from the

feelings of our nature; and of course proves that such is the fact. The Bible and Phrenology, then perfectly harmonize. Of the fall of man in Adam, and his salvation through Christ the Redeemer, Phrenology says nothing, and for this reason; neither of them is a *necessary* part of man's nature. To every thing pertaining to this point we must look to revelation, and to revelation alone. This discovery is its peculiar prerogative.

Now every fact is consistent with every other fact. Chymistry and mineralogy are consistent with each other, are adapted to each other, and strengthen each other, because both are only different parts of the same great whole. And as every truth, is consistent with every other truth, it is inconsistent with every untruth. Phrenology, then, if it be true, is consistent with every thing else that is true, and inconsistent with every thing that is untrue. We see that Phrenology is perfectly consistent with anatomy and also with revelation. The truth of all three is thus demonstrated.

Phrenology is not inconsistent with any of the sciences. But if it were untrue, it would be inconsistent with *all* of them. Phrenology then must be admitted till the other sciences are discarded. But Phrenology disagrees, point blank, with infidelity, and atheism, and materialism, and deism, which deny that there is a God, a future state, such a thing as right in the abstract, as guilt, &c. Therefore, since Phrenology is true, they are all untrue.

But what have objections to do where *matters of fact* are concerned. The question is *not* to what objections Phrenology is liable, but whether Phrenology is a *matter of fact* or not. Settle this by experiment, and observation, and physical demonstration, and then let objections and objectors take care of themselves. If Phrenology is *not* a matter of fact, reject it on that ground. But if it is, let it be admitted, no matter to what objections it is liable. Let it cut its own philosophical swath straight through all religious and sectarian prejudice—all conflicting and contracted philosophical theories. If it mows down your system of religion or philosophy, or ethics, be it so; let them go to the winds. You are sure that you are right; your neighbor is also equally sure that he too is right; though he thinks directly contrary to yourself. Now one of you are certainly wrong, and both are liable to be. But if your religious system is true, and Phrenology is also true, fear not; for each will support the other. But if your religion is false, you do not surely wish to retain it.

If Phrenology is true, nothing will do more for true religion; so that moralists had better study it; as it will completely settle many of their puzzling questions. As a body of divinity, it is far better than any other thing, the Bible excepted.

But let over zealous moralists, who pretend to infer fatalism, and materialism, and many other isms, from Phrenology, beware, or they get themselves into difficulty, for if, after all, Phrenology becomes established, (as it most unquestionably will,) then fatalists, materialists, infidels &c. will prove their various creeds out of your own mouths.

They will argue thus: "According to your own argument, Phrenology, if true, leads to materialism, infidelity, &c. Phrenology is true, therefore, materialism, infidelity, &c. must be admitted." Out of your own mouth will they condemn you, even though your arguments are spurious, or else they will drive you to the disagreeable necessity of admitting that your arguments are weak and fallacious.

O. S. FOWLER.

APPENDIX.

[A.]

From the Lutheran Observer.

PHRENOLOGY TESTED.

We this morning witnessed a practical exhibition of the principles of Phrenology, which was exceedingly interesting, and in our view, furnished very strong evidence in favor of its claims on public confidence. It is pretty generally known that Mr. Fowler is at present engaged in delivering a course of lectures on this subject at the corner of Baltimore and Gay streets; last night his lecture was attended among others by the editor of this paper, who it may not be amiss to observe, has always been decidedly opposed to Phrenology. We were, after the lecture, introduced to Mr. Fowler, and a controversy immediately ensued. At the close of the discussion, we took the liberty to remark that we had two sons, one 15 and the other 13 years of age;—that if Mr. F. thought proper to examine their heads, and could give a correct description of their intellectual and moral character, we would yield to all moderate pretensions of phrenologists; but nothing short of facts—plain positive facts, could convince us. Mr. F. assented to this proposal, and was perfectly willing, so far as he was concerned, that the science should stand or fall by this test. Accordingly, this morning, accompanied by a few respectable and literary gentlemen of this city, we conducted our sons to Mr. F.'s room, at the corner of Baltimore and South Charles streets; having previously prepared a written description of the mental qualities, dispositions, &c. of the lads, with a view to compare it with what Mr. F. should remark concerning them. Mr. F. had never before seen the boys, but immediately commenced examining their heads and describing their characteristic traits minutely, fully, and unequivocally; when finished, his delineation was compared with that previously written for the occasion, and strange as it may appear, there was a most striking and astonishing coincidence, with but one single item of discrepancy. Although we had heretofore been not only a sceptic but often ridiculed the pretensions of Phrenology, we were staggered and astounded; our surprise was beyond measure, and we hesitate not to declare that we are now convinced that there is indeed a most momentous reality in the matter; and contrary to our inclination, and in opposition to our deep rooted and cherished prepossessions, we are constrained to admit that Phrenology is indeed a science based upon sound and irrefragable principles, and well worthy the attention of all, and especially of teachers, ministers and others concerned in educating and meliorating the condition of men. This, we believe, is also the opinion of all the gentlemen who attended to witness the interesting scene. After the lads had been pronounced upon, we ourselves and our friend, Mr. —, sat down and were examined; and it is conceded on all hands that Mr. F. was not less successful in our cases than in relation to the boys. The whole company departed highly gratified, and immensely astonished at the disclosures made by Phrenology.

Nothing but facts, stubborn and irrefutable facts, could have produced the conviction and amazement which evidently possessed the minds of those present.

Mr. F. manifestly understands his favorite science, and is withal an agreeable and interesting lecturer. We now verily believe that great injustice has been done to this department of useful study, and to those who in spite of the taunts and jest of opponents, are zealously pursuing it. Phrenology is destined to rise and become extensively useful, and as truth is mighty, and will ultimately prevail, so this branch of learning, must eventually triumph over every obstacle, and maintain a high rank in the circle of science.

We write this unsolicited by Mr. F. or any body else, and regard all that we have stated as a very feeble testimony to the claims of Phrenology, as well as to the merits of Mr. Fowler, the lecturer.

[B.]

PHRENOLOGICAL TRIUMPH.

Mr. Barnes—Notwithstanding that the Phrenologists have allotted to me but a *small* development of the organ of *Marvelousness*, yet I cannot withhold from the public the high gratification, and the strong impression in favor of Phrenology, which I, with many of our fellow-citizens, received at Mr. Fowler's phrenological *test* exhibition, last evening; nor will my *Secretiveness* allow me to withhold a brief sketch of the proceedings of the evening. I look upon them as the greatest triumph of science, over prejudice, that I ever did, or, perhaps, ever shall, witness; a triumph deeply interesting, not only to this community, but—shall I say it?—to the world!

Mr. F. entered our city, a few weeks ago for the purpose of converting us to the phrenological faith. To this end, he laid before us, in direct and unequivocal terms, his plan of operation and his pretensions, which were no less than *accurately* to describe, on a first interview, and in an off-hand manner, all the leading traits of character, including talents, disposition, and propensities, of every man, woman and child that should be presented to him, by merely feeling of the phrenological *bumps* that might have clustered around his cranium. To some of our citizens, the boldness of this proposition seemed a little startling, for they could not conceive it possible that Mr. F. could redeem his pledges to the public, nor in what corner of his garret he had left a mousehole to crawl out at, in case he should be detected of imposture. I went, like many others, *doubting*; but came away, (like many others,) filled with admiration, or, rather, petrified with astonishment. With what invisible spirit he had held converse, that had whispered in his ear my whole character, and had enabled him, in his terse, quaint, energetic style, to reveal to me, in a few minutes, not only all my most prominent, leading traits of character, but, also, these traits in *detail*, as well as many minor points—to give me, in short, an accurate and philosophical *analysis* of my mind, as if it had been spread out before me on a map, (for, in the examinations made by Mr. F. he gives a *chart* of the character of each individual, in which is described his leading characteristics, and the relative power and bearing of each perceptive, animal, and intellectual faculty;—for him thus suddenly to enter into the most secret chambers of my inner man, and call over, one by one, all the various passions, propensities, appetites, feelings,—hopes, fears, forebodings,

and aspirations, that *consciousness* alone had previously told me, dwelt there, *this*—*THIS* was more than I could account for. I had passed the meridian of life without ever having had my fortune told; and in regard to its ever being *correctly* told in this world, I was, up to that hour, an incorrigible sceptic. But here was a man, and a *young* and *inexperienced* man, too, who, by the application of what he called scientific principles, “told me all things that ever I did.” He told me, that God had placed upon my head, upon the heads of all, visible and tangible signs, by which to indicate the inward powers and propensities of the mind; and that simply by looking at, and feeling of, these outward signs, he, or any one else thoroughly acquainted with Phrenology, could truly tell all that dwelt within. This was, to me, truly wonderful—wonderful, not merely because God, in his infinite wisdom and goodness, had so ordained, but because the blindness of man has caused him to grope through so many ages without *discovering* these outward and visible signs, or, at least, without gaining such a knowledge of them as to reduce them to system and order.

But could I *believe* it?—Here was an appeal to my senses and my consciousness, and *they* told me that what the Phrenologist had said, was—*true*. Could I *believe* it? No. Here was but *one* case. I must seek farther evidence. The Phrenologist has marked me high in *Causality*, and low in *Marvelousness*.

Well, I took some friends to the phrenological fortune-teller. Did he fail? No. He hit off their characters *admirably*.

This won't do. I'll *swamp* him, yet. Another lot of friends, whose characters I am *sure* I understand, is brought before the phrenological magician. You have brought the swarms of flies, and of locusts, and the frogs, and the hail upon Egypt, and have turned her river into blood; but you cannot bring the *lice*. What was the result?—“Self-esteem is high in this man, and low in that; love of money is this man's ruling passion, and love of fame, that man's; this man is a speaker, that man, a thinker; this man reasons well, that man, ill; the one reasons by induction, the other, (moderately,) by analogy; this man is ambitious and enterprising, that man, grovelling and low-minded; this man is affable and familiar, that, reserved and austere; this man is honest, frank, and benevolent, that man, secretive, sly, and deceitful. Here is a man of great energy of character, who sways a commanding influence, but that man will always plod along in a low station, and follow some leader. Combateness, here is a man who would face the cannon's mouth, and not a nerve would tremble; the coward legs of the gentleman upon his left, would run before a regiment of mice.” True, true; every word of it *true*. I *know* it to be true. That is the beauty and the great wonderment of the thing. He told, and *truly* told, all I knew of their characters, and even more. I am half a convert. But did not Mr. F. make *any* mistakes? Certainly. He does not profess to be *infallible*. It was not, however, the *great*, but the *small* number of his mistakes, that astonished me.

The science of Phrenology, as promulgated in our city by Mr. Fowler, has met with not a little opposition and ridicule. To satisfy the incredulous, therefore, of its truth, as well as more firmly to establish the faith of new converts, Mr. F. proposed publicly to meet his opponents, and to put Phrenology to the most rigid and scrutinizing *test*; and with that intent, got up a meeting in the Lecture Room of the Baltimore Lyceum, on Thursday evening last.

His first test was, to examine before the audience, (which was *very large*,) the phrenological developments of two twin brothers, and to give their characters. The twins are children, aged 5 or 6, whose education and training have been alike, but whose dispositions and talents widely differ—the sons of a highly respectable professional gentleman of our city. It being known by the testimony of their respectable parent, that Mr. F. had never seen either of the boys, nor heard one word about their respective characters, only that they *differed*, their presentation before the audience produced not a little anxiety and excitement, enough, at least, to evince the intense interest taken in the examination by the respective partizans who had previously declared either for, or against Phrenology. With a boldness and intrepidity which nothing but the highest confidence in his abilities, directed by true principles, could inspire, Mr. F. proceeded with the examination, describing, as he went along, in strong, plain, and unequivocal terms, not only their most prominent points of character, such as their respective dispositions, including their passions, temperaments, propensities, and the like; and, also, their respective talents and abilities, but he went even into detail, and minutely described many of the nice shades of difference in their habits and modes of thinking.

As soon as Mr. F. closed his examination, the father of the children, in an audible voice, read to the audience a minute and eloquent description of the character of each of the boys, as he had *previously* written it out; and by comparing his description with that given by Mr. F., it appeared that the two differed, on all the numerous points of character described, *only in one slight particular*, viz. Mr. F. had attributed to one, *more generosity* than the parent supposed him to possess.* The victory of Mr. F. was complete, as was strongly evinced by the long and loud applauses of the audience—to the no small confusion and discomfiture of the obstinately sceptical, and to the high gratification of the non-committal or *fence* men, many of whom jumped down on the phrenological side.

But this victory was but a prelude to those more triumphant ones that were to follow. Mr. F. proceeded to examine the heads of many who presented themselves for the purpose, and to describe and hit off their characters with astonishing accuracy. It was soon proposed, however, that he should examine some present who had been *previously* examined by him, and who had Mr. F's *charts* of their character in their pockets, in order to *compare* the former descriptions of character with those that should then be given.

Mr. F. declined not this most scrutinizing test, for, on a former occasion, both he and the audience had been not a little bored by a great deal of noise that was made about a chart Mr. F. had given a young gentleman in our city, which did not, in all its numbers, exactly agree with a chart given to the same individual some time previous in New York.

In Mr. F's chart, the 35 phrenological organs are all numbered and described; and as Mr. F. proceeds with the examination of a head, he marks on the chart, opposite to each organ, *another number*, indicative of the *relative* size of each organ, as the whole are developed in the same head. This last set of numbers, varies in a scale from 1 to 20.

Before he proceeded to this test, however, Mr. F. explained, and said,

*The mother, on learning my decision, remarked that I was right; and said that the lad had more Benevolence than the father gave him credit for. I had this from the father himself.

O. S. FOWLER.

that he did not profess to judge of the relative size of each organ with such exactitude as to enable him twice or thrice to mark the whole 35 organs for the same individual, *exactly alike*; that this would be requiring more than any human being could be expected to perform, and, consequently, more than could reasonably be demanded of Phrenology; but that he *did* profess to be able twice, thrice, or ten times, to describe the *character* of the same individual, *alike*.

Mr. F. then went on with the examination of two gentlemen, feeling out their bumps, and numbering them; and as each number was pronounced, the corresponding one on the chart was also pronounced by a gentleman appointed for the purpose; and the result was, that in thus rapidly naming off the relative size of some 50 or 60 organs, *more than one-half agreed exactly* with those previously written down on the two charts; and among the whole, only *one* number differed materially: and this *one*, as it differed 10, Mr. F. attributed rather to a slip of the *pen*, than to a dereliction of judgment.*

It was then proposed that Mr. F. should *cover his eyes*, and then examine; and although it deprived him of the important assistance (to which, too, he had always been accustomed,) of *sight*, in connexion with *touch*, Mr. F. faltered not, but boldly proceeded to gratify the audience in any manner, whether reasonable or unreasonable, that they might choose: and to the utter astonishment of all, a number of characters thus rapidly hit off, leaped out from the mint so strongly and elegantly stamped, that all their acquaintances would have known them at the first glance, even had they, like the Phrenologist, been blind-folded. It seemed more like magic than any thing else. The ends of Mr. F's. fingers operated as if they had been inspired.

Towards the close of the examination, several very diverting cases occurred. One gentleman was accused by Mr. F. as possessing great *energy* of character and *moral courage*, which qualities called into requisition, in no small degree, his *combaliveness*. The gentleman arose, and declared to the audience, that Mr. F. had sketched his character very accurately, except in this particular; but as for *combative*ness, he had it not: and to prove that he was right, he went on with so *energetic* and *combative* a speech, as soon to convince all present, that *he*, and not Mr. F. had mistaken his own character. The ludicrous and happy circumstance, elicited tremendous applause for the Phrenologist.

Another gentleman examined, seemed to insinuate to the audience, that he possessed not the *mechanical* ingenuity attributed to him by Mr. F. By after confessions, however, it appeared, that the *tinkering* propensity of the gentleman, (though not a mechanic by *profession*,) has caused him to amass a great variety of *tools*, and that he has been guilty of indulging his mechanical ingenuity, with considerable success, in *drawing*—which comes under Mr. F's. description of *Constructiveness*—(see Chart.)

But the most *satisfactory* case of all, was yet to come. Mr. F. had frequently desired some one to come forward, whose character was very *prominent*, or well known to the audience for some *striking*, and *peculiar qualities*; and was now requested to blind-fold himself again, with the expectation of being gratified in this particular. Accordingly, a gentleman was prevailed upon to submit to examination, who is more distinguished for certain bold and strong characteristics, than any other in

* In a similar test at Mr. Fowler's office, the writer of this notice, saw Mr. F. mark a second chart for a gentleman, on which 34 of the 35 numbers agreed *exactly* with the first chart, and the other number differed but *slightly*.

our city. The Phrenologist was *completely successful*. He gave the character in bold and graphic style, and with an *accuracy* that could scarcely have been equalled by any one of his numerous acquaintances present. The conviction of skill and truth on the part of the Phrenologist, went home so powerfully to the minds of the audience, that their applauses several times interrupted the examination.

But there was, at least, one sceptic who yet remained incorrigible: and this was a man who, the writer is informed, is notorious for his overweening fondness for "the root of all evil." This worshipper of Midas could not be persuaded but that Mr. F. had previous knowledge of the head just examined, and therefore desired his own to be brought in contact with the magical touchstone. But no sooner did the inspired fingers of Mr. F. play upon the golden bumps of our money-loving hero, than his *acquisitive* character burst forth before the audience in so strong relief, as utterly to shock the incredulity of its owner, who soon begged for "quarters," and was let off—to the great diversion of all present.

AUDITOR.

From the Pittsburg Times.

We attended at the Penitentiary during the afternoon of Friday, along with several gentlemen, to see Messrs. Farnham and Fowler, examine the heads of the convicts. These two gentlemen have been delivering lectures, &c., at the Hall of the Young Men's Society, and the purpose of the visit was to test their Phrenological skill. They passed through the ordeal in a manner calculated to demonstrate, not only the authenticity of the science, but also the fairness of their own claims to an acquaintance with its principles.

In no instance did they seem to err, either in relation to the nature of the offence in question, or in the particular details of character which they generally stated minutely. The dispositions of some of the convicts were pronounced as equivocal: thus—one was said to be liable to commit rape, or murder, or possibly theft. The conviction had been for rape. Another was stated to be prone to murder—or to commit destruction in some way. The conviction had been for house burning. The uncommon mechanical powers and high intellectual cast of another were well indicated. The case of ———, who robbed Mr. Cook, was well stated. The thieves, who were numerous, were generally designated very explicitly. The boy Hazlet, was represented as being not particularly prone to criminality; except that he would be liable to be led by others to any sort of crime. This was the well known case of manslaughter, committed at Wilkesburgh by a gang of boys, at the instigation of certain notorious villains.

In the evening we submitted to their inspection the skull of a very remarkable character, a most devoted boxer and blackguard. They returned a written description singularly correct.—Remarking among other things, that "he was continually under the influence of a querulous, barbarous disposition," &c., "the slave of his propensities; loved quarrelling as well as eating."

Altogether, their opinions were entirely satisfactory, and given with as much precision as the nature of such a science could admit.

ERRATA.—Page 9, 3d line from the bottom for *vica* read *vicc*; page 10, 12th line from the bottom, *negative* for *affirmative*; and in the next line *affirmative* for *negative*; in a part of the edition, page 13, 17th line, for *facia* read *facie*; page 31, note, for *remembered* read *re-numbered*; page 32, note, omit the second *that*.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1835, by O. S. FOWLER, in the Clerk's office of the District Court of the Northern District of New-York.

Printed by the Northern District of New-York.

Printed by the Northern District of New-York.

Printed by the Northern District of New-York.